

The Catholic Educational Review

JUNE, 1925

THE PROPER ATTITUDE OF THE CATHOLIC SCIENTIST TOWARD EVOLUTION¹

To propose for discussion the attitude a Catholic scientist should take toward evolution might seem at first sight to lend support to the age-old charges that the Church is opposed to science; that she dictates to her children what position they shall take in scientific questions; that Catholics are not free to investigate the mysteries of nature, but must always follow the guidance of ecclesiastical authority in the interpretation of natural phenomena. Such a process of reasoning, however, is at once shown to be faulty when attention is called to the fact that there is a very clear distinction between the doctrine of evolution as a scientific hypothesis and the same doctrine as a philosophical theory of life. With regard to the former doctrine, which aims to investigate the succession of plants and animals since the first appearance of life upon our globe and to explain this succession as due to a process of evolution from one or a few primitive forms, the Church is not directly concerned; and we shall endeavor to show that in determining what shall be his attitude toward this hypothesis the Catholic scientist is as free and untrammelled as any other seeker after truth. The same may be said when there is question of the theory as applied to a system of cosmogony or geogony.

But when we come to the philosophical theory of evolution, that, namely, which endeavors to explain the origin, nature and final object of the universe, we are dealing with a question that transcends the scope of natural science and can be solved only in the light of metaphysical investigation. In the solution of

¹ An address delivered before the Chemical Seminar of the Catholic University, March 13, 1925.

this question the Church has a vital interest; for here we touch upon matters that are intimately related to faith and morality and as such fall legitimately within the domain of the Church as the divinely constituted teacher of mankind. For there is a Christian philosophy of the universe so intimately bound up with the religion of Christianity that the acceptance of the one necessitates the acceptance of the other; the collapse of the one means the downfall of the other. As custodian of the faith given by Christ, the Church champions a philosophy of the world which conforms to the teaching of the Divine Master, and this she proposes to her followers as the only system consonant with revealed truth. Catholics, whether they be scientists or not, are obliged to accept this philosophy; not because the Church arbitrarily says it is true, but because it is established by sound metaphysical arguments and confirmed by the testimony of the revealed word of God. The leading principles of this philosophical system, which may be called the theistic, may be summed up briefly.

Christian philosophy is founded upon the existence of a personal God, who is eternal, self-existent and infinitely perfect. Then it postulates creation. God created the world in time. Thus it is opposed to the monistic teaching that identifies God with the world and assumes the existence of matter with its laws from all eternity. The theistic system holds, moreover, that man possesses a rational soul which is a simple, spiritual substance, created by God and endowed with the gift of life undying. There are other postulates of Christian philosophy that are of importance from the standpoint of belief and conduct, but the ones mentioned are all that need concern us here; and it is to be noted that these are such as may be arrived at by the light of reason alone.² With regard to the acceptance of these fundamentals there can be no freedom other than the freedom that comes from a knowledge of the truth. The Catholic scientist, therefore, if he be a metaphysician and a philosopher as well, accepts these principles as a result of his own reflective

² It is not certain that the immortality of the soul can be proved by reason alone. "The dogma of the soul's immortality is based on its simplicity and spirituality. Whether this truth is philosophically demonstrable or not is a question that the Church has left open:" Pohle-Preuss, *God, the Author of Nature and the Supernatural*; St. Louis, 1916; p. 151. The necessity of creation can be proved by reason but the fact that the world was not created from eternity can be proved only by revelation.

thought, aided by the light of Divine revelation. If, on the contrary, as often happens, he is unskilled in the study of metaphysics and philosophy, he accepts them on the authority of the Church, just as he accepts scientific truths in fields other than his own on the authority of men who are specialists in those fields.

We are now in a position to discuss the attitude of the Catholic scientist toward the theory of evolution as understood in various other senses, some of which we referred to above. Let us first take up the theory as applied to a system of cosmogony. As used in this sense, the theory of evolution is practically equivalent to the Nebular Hypothesis which is associated with the names of Kant and Laplace. I need not stop to explain this theory, advanced to account for the origin of the solar system, as I presume it is already familiar to my readers. I pause only to call attention to the fact that it is "emphatically a speculation which cannot be demonstrated by observation or established by mathematical calculation."³ This is true whether we limit it to the explanation of the origin of our solar system alone or extend it to embrace the universe as a whole. But the point I wish to make clear is that there is nothing in the theory that is contradictory to the teachings of Christian philosophy; and the Catholic scientist is free to accept or reject it according as he considers the evidence sufficient or not. From what we have said above it will be evident that he is obliged to admit the creation of the original nebula by God;⁴ and to the same author he must of necessity attribute the origin of motion in the universe, which otherwise cannot be explained, and likewise the laws by which the evolution has taken place; but granted these postulates, demanded not by religion but by philosophy, he may speculate to his heart's content regarding the origin of the universe or rather the methods by which it has reached its present condition.

Christian philosophy, indeed, might be said to favor the evolutionary view of the development of the inorganic world. It is true that some great Christian thinkers held that from the first

³ Ball, Sir Robert Stawell, F.R.S., LL.D. Art., "Nebular Theory," in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 11th Ed.

⁴ "Even if it (geology) could decisively prove Laplace's hypothesis, according to which all portions of this universe . . . originally made up a single nebular mass, there would still remain the very reasonable question, whence came this mass and what was its origin?" Nys, Desire, Ph.D. Art., "Cosmology," in *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. IV, p. 414.

moment of creation the inorganic world was substantially the same as it is today; but many of them, from St. Gregory of Nyssa to our own time, have held that the progressive formation of the world is due immediately to the powers latent in created matter, or "to the concourse of secondary causes acting in accordance with the tendency which they had received from God for this end."⁵ Father Wasmann, in fact, lays down as one of the postulates of the theistic view of creation "the subjection to law of the whole cosmic evolution and of the entire evolution of the inorganic world, asserting that the first combination of atoms or electrons contained the definite material disposition from which, in the course of the succeeding millions of years, all the various constellations of atoms were to result by way of natural evolution."⁶ The chemist will observe how closely this postulate conforms to the modern theories with regard to the composition of matter and the arrangement of electrons in the atom.

Before proceeding to the discussion of the other phases of the theory of evolution it may be well to explain more in detail the teaching of Christian philosophy with regard to the action of secondary causes, mentioned in the preceding paragraph. Christian philosophy holds that God is the First Cause and that every effect is attributable ultimately to Him. In the words of a recent writer, "God cooperates directly in the production of every effect due to a created cause; throughout the process He is exerting an efficient causality proper to Himself, so that the result in all its stages is partially attributable to His direct agency."⁷ This is in accordance with what is called by philosophers *concursus divinus*, or divine concurrence, which denotes the fact that just as created things by their very nature depend upon the Creator not only for their existence but also for their continuance in being, so also do they depend upon Him for the sustained exercise of their active powers. Whatever powers created causes have, therefore, they have received from God;

⁵ H. de Dorlodot, "Darwinism and Catholic Thought." London, 1922, p. 79. See this author for a discussion of St. Gregory's opinions; *opus cit.*, pp. 72 ff. Cf. also Lahousse, Gustavus, *Cosmologia*, Louvain, 1887, p. 340, Thesis 36.

⁶ Wasmann, Erich, S.J., "The Problem of Evolution." St. Louis, 1909, p. 28. *Idem*, Art., Evolution, in *Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. V, p. 654.

⁷ Joyce, George Hayward, S.J., "Principles of Natural Theology." London, 1923, p. 535.

and whatever effects they produce may be attributed properly to God, not only because of the original act by which He communicated to them whatever of potency they possess, but also because "in every operation of a finite cause there is a divine concurrence in virtue of which it is productive of this effect."⁸ This does not imply that God is constantly interfering with the activity of His creatures. On the contrary, He has given to created beings certain powers and activities by virtue of which they are able to produce their effects without any special intervention on His part. They act in accordance with what we ordinarily call natural laws, that is, according to certain modes of activity that flow from their very nature. As these laws are communicated to created things by God, we must grant to Him the power of suspending or supplementing their activity in various ways if He so wills; and when this occurs we have a miracle properly so called. But miracles, it must be noted, are not of everyday occurrence.⁹ Christian philosophy, in fact, obliges us to admit the existence of a miracle only when we are unable to explain an event by natural causes, that is, without special divine intervention. God's ordinary government of the world is carried out according to His divine plan through the agency of secondary causes and the ordinary activities of these are governed by natural laws.¹⁰

We are familiar with many of the laws of nature and we can predict with certainty how many of the material forces that science is acquainted with will act under a given set of conditions; but no one will venture to say that we have plumbed the depths of the mysteries of nature. We know, in other words, many of the laws of nature but we are by no means familiar with all of them. Science is every day bringing to light the existence of powers in nature that our predecessors never dreamed of. I need mention only, by way of example, the phenomena of radio activity and the Roentgen ray. No one, and least of all the Catholic philosopher, would think of attributing these and similar phenomena to the direct intervention of God. Witnessing them, the reasonable man concludes that

⁸ *Ibidem*. See also H. de Dorlodot, *opus cit.*, pp. 43 ff.

⁹ We are speaking here of miracles as ordinarily understood. It is doubtful whether every answer to prayer cannot be considered a miracle in the wide sense in as much as it seems to imply a special intervention of God.

¹⁰ H. de Dorlodot, *opus cit.*, pp 115-117.

we have, in the words of Kepler, "rediscovered another thought of God," and the Christian especially feels impelled to utter a prayer of thanksgiving to the Giver of all good gifts for this further manifestation of His power and of His bounty toward man. So if it should come to pass that science discovers in primeval matter the power to combine its atoms or rearrange its electrons so as to produce the various elements and compounds with which we are familiar today, as well as others as yet unknown, the Christian philosopher will conclude that the whole process has taken place in accordance with the laws of nature and in virtue of the power originally communicated to matter by the Creator. It seems to me that this is a noble concept, thoroughly consistent with our idea of God, recognizing in Him, as it does, the power to endow created beings with the ability to evolve into more and more complex forms. Indeed, it would appear that thus we "have actually a greater idea of God than if we regard Him as constantly interfering with the working of the laws of nature."¹¹

Let us turn now to the theory of evolution as applied to the origin and development of plants and animals. Briefly stated, this theory aims to explain the succession of life forms as due to a process of transformation by which all the different species of plants and animals existing today, as well as those that have ceased to exist, have been evolved from one or a few simple forms. The theory has taken various forms ranging from a moderate system of evolution which postulates the special intervention of the Creator, infusing life into one or a few elementary organisms, through absolute evolution which rejects this intervention even in the origin of life, to the monism of Haeckel and his followers which, denying the existence of God, or asserting His identity with the universe, assumes the existence of the material world from all eternity, postulates the spontaneous generation of the first organisms from inorganic matter, rejects any idea of purpose in the evolution of the world and, finally, denies any essential difference between man and brutes.¹² This monistic doctrine, which is a metaphysical or philosophical theory, need not concern us here. What we have said above concerning the teaching of Christian philosophy will show the

¹¹ Wasmann, Erich, S.J., *The Problem of Evolution*, p. 19.

¹² *Idem*, p. 25.

impossibility of our adherence on metaphysical grounds to any such system as this. The other two forms of the theory of evolution, however, are acknowledged scientific hypotheses in favor of which many facts are adduced as evidence; and so we may ask what is to be our attitude toward them. For the present we shall exclude from our consideration the question of the evolution of man which we shall discuss later.

Both these theories, moderate evolution and absolute evolution, are opposed to the theories of permanence and special creation. The former of these holds that the species of plants and animals have remained essentially unchanged and that for each existing species we must postulate the creation of a pair of organisms at the beginning. This theory is associated especially with the names of Linnaeus and Cuvier. The latter gained considerable notoriety for himself and almost world-wide acceptance of the theory he upheld by carrying off the laurels in a discussion with Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, a colleague of Lamarck, conducted under the auspices of the French Academy of Sciences in 1830. The theory of special creation endeavors to overcome the objections to the theory of permanence that arose from the study of paleontology and postulates a series of successive creations, widely separated in time, to account for the appearance of new species. Many students of nature hold that neither of these theories offers a satisfactory explanation of the organic world as we know it today and propose instead a system of evolution to account for the origin and development of plant and animal forms. Some scientists of this school have been content to advance the theory as a plausible explanation of many observed phenomena while others have gone so far as to assert the impossibility of any other explanation and lay down the doctrine of evolution as a demonstrated law. For the latter there is no longer any question of the fact of evolution; the only point that remains to be settled is to determine the causes of evolution and the methods by which it has taken place. Here there is wide divergence of opinion but the limits of our paper will not permit us to give even an outline of the hypotheses proposed. Our immediate concern is with the theory of evolution as such and we are asked: May we as Catholics admit the possibility or probability of organic evolution or are we committed to a choice between the theory of permanence and the theory

of special creation to account for the various species of plants and animals that exist at the present time?

Let us consider first the moderate theory of evolution. The principal tenets of this theory, according to Canon Dorlodot, can be summed up in the two following propositions:

1. The primary origin of living beings is the result of a special influence on the part of the Creator, who infused life into one or a few elementary organisms.

2. These organisms, by evolving in the course of ages, have given rise to all the organic species which exist at the present time, as well as those which have come down to us only in the fossil state.¹³

Now the question is asked: What is the attitude of the Church with regard to this theory? It can be answered briefly. Many Catholics have defended the theory of moderate evolution but the Church as such has not as yet deemed it necessary or expedient to express her opinion officially on the matter. There is no real connection between this theory and matters of faith and morals with which the Church is concerned so she leaves its discussion in the hands of the physical scientists where it properly belongs.

But, it will be perhaps objected, the Catholic Church teaches the inspiration and the consequent freedom from error, of the Holy Scriptures, whereas the theory of evolution, even in the moderate form of which we are speaking, would seem to contradict the account of creation given in the Book of Genesis. To enter into a detailed discussion of this oft-repeated objection would carry us beyond the limits of the present paper; so we shall content ourselves with a brief summary of the teaching of the Church on this matter. The Holy Scriptures, according to her view, were not intended to serve as a scientific treatise on the constitution of the material world;¹⁴ they were meant to teach men the way of salvation, their duties towards God and their dependence on Him.¹⁵ Pope Leo XIII, in his Encyclical, *Providentissimus Deus*, lays particular stress on this point.

¹³ H. de Dorlodot, *opus cit.*, p. 4.

¹⁴ "The proper purpose of the Mosaic narrative is not scientific, but strictly religious; hence we must not seek astronomy, physics, geology, etc., in the Hexameron, but chiefly religious instruction." Pohle-Preuss, *opus cit.*, p. 105.

¹⁵ *Idem*, p. 106.

"The Encyclical appeals here again to the words of the great African Doctor (St. Aug., de Gen. ad litt., II, ix, xx): [The Holy Ghost] who spoke by them [the inspired writers] did not intend to teach men these things [i.e., the essential nature of the things of the visible universe], things in no way profitable unto salvation.'"¹⁶ For this reason, as Canon Dorlodot says, "We must reject *a priori* any interpretation that would make a text of Holy Writ a Divine instruction upon a subject belonging to the physical or natural sciences."¹⁷ But how explain the apparent contradictions? By bearing in mind that the Sacred Writers, knowing the mentality of the people they were addressing, used terms that were suited to their understanding and consequently spoke of things as they appeared rather than according to their inmost constitution. Moreover, they did not hesitate to make use of figurative language even in describing historical events. "The Sacred Writers," says Pope Leo XIII, "described and dealt with things in more or less figurative language, or in terms which were commonly used at the time, and which in many instances are in daily use at this day, even by the most eminent men of science. Ordinary speech primarily and properly describes what comes under the senses; and somewhat in the same way, the Sacred Writers—as the Angelic Doctor reminds us (Summa, I. Q. lxx, a. 1, ad 3um)—'went by what visibly appeared,' or put down what God, speaking to men, signified in a way men could understand and were accustomed to."¹⁸ It is worthy of note that St. Augustine, to whose authority Pope Leo appeals in the Encyclical quoted, as well as other learned leaders of thought in the early Church were favorable to an evolutionary explanation of the organic world and showed by their writings that they felt in no way bound to follow the strict literal interpretation of every word and phrase of Holy Scripture and particularly of the first three chapters of Genesis.¹⁹ Coming down to our own day, we find Catholic scientists of excellent repute like Wasmann, Dorlodot, and Obermaier, not to mention a host of others, following a similar procedure. The Catholic scientist, therefore, who, after examining the evidence for organic evolution, comes to the conclusion that he is in pos-

¹⁶ Maas, A. J., S.J., Art., Exegesis, Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. V, p. 699.

¹⁷ *Opus cit.*, p. 11. Cf. also Wasmann, *opus cit.*, p. 17.

¹⁸ Maas, Art. cit. Cf. also Dorlodot, *opus cit.*, p. 12 ff.

¹⁹ For a discussion of this point see Dorlodot, *opus cit.*, pp. 66-87.

session of a scientific hypothesis which offers a more satisfactory explanation of the origin and development of the plants and animals that inhabit the world today than does the theory of permanence or that of special creation, may feel assured that he is in excellent company and in no danger of having his orthodoxy questioned by the Church. "All that can be justly demanded is that the scientist refrain from positively contradicting the Word of God, e.g., by defending such propositions as: 'Matter is eternal'; 'Matter and energy are the sole principles of the universe'; 'The world originated by mere chance'; and so forth. In all other matters, such as the nebular hypothesis, the evolution of species, etc., he may hold any conclusions that seem warranted."²⁰

Can the same be said of the scientist who adheres to the theory of absolute evolution which does away with the special intervention of God even in the origin of life, prescinding again from the origin of man? I think it can. No one holds today that plants and animals were created directly by God in the sense that they were made from nothing. On the contrary, the rational opinion is that God in creating them made use of previously created inorganic matter. Now there is nothing in the teaching of faith that obliges us to postulate a special intervention of God in the origin of vegetative or sensitive life. Rather is it entirely consistent with our idea of God's omnipotence to conceive that He might have given to inorganic matter, in addition to its other qualities, the power to become highly organized and, ultimately, living matter by the simple action of natural forces. According to many modern authorities it would seem that both St. Augustine and St. Gregory of Nyssa adhered to this opinion.²¹ The idea of such an evolution of living things from inorganic matter could have presented no great difficulty when the theory of spontaneous generation was universally accepted as was the case not only in the first centuries of the Christian era but all through the period of scholastic philosophy and even we might say to our own day. The limits of such generation were variously fixed by different writers and the active influence of the heavenly bodies was called in to explain the process but the

²⁰ Pohle-Preuss, *opus cit.*, p. 108.

²¹ Cf. Dorlodot, *opus cit.*, pp. 66-87.

fact that life was generated from nonliving substance was never called in question. For the lower forms of life, at least, it was not thought necessary to attribute their origin to the direct activity of God. From the standpoint of philosophy, indeed, there is no necessity of postulating a special divine intervention to account for the first beginnings of life. Granted the initial act of creation by which matter was brought into existence and endowed with the necessary power, the origin of life from non-living things is unquestionably possible. However, Science steps in here and writes her veto. Spontaneous generation contradicts the facts of observation, she says; and it would seem that the experiments of Pasteur and Tyndall, which have been confirmed by hundreds of experimenters, will not permit us to doubt this dictum. Thus Philosophy is thrown back upon the necessity of attributing the origin of life to an agency outside of inorganic matter and we are compelled to abandon the theory of absolute evolution, at least in the light of our present knowledge. Of course, it may happen that scientists will some day be able to prove that spontaneous generation might have occurred under different conditions than those prevailing upon the earth today. In that case, it will be readily seen, Philosophy will have no difficulty in relinquishing a postulate that Science has forced upon her.²²

Finally we are questioned as to the attitude of the Church toward the theory of evolution as applied to man. Before attempting to answer this question we must refer again to the postulates of Christian philosophy that were mentioned in the first part of this article, especially to the simplicity and spirituality of the human soul. Man is not merely an animal; he is composed of body and soul. Hence, as Father Wasmann says, zoology alone is not competent to decide the question of the origin of man; psychology has a right to express its views on this subject.²³ Now psychology, by which I mean that psychology which forms a part of Christian philosophy, holds that the origin of the soul can be attributed only to direct creation on the part of God; and this conclusion is based upon the nature of the soul which is a simple, spiritual entity, as may be deduced from an

²² Wasmann, *opus cit.*, p. 29.

²³ *Idem*, pp. 53 and 161.

analysis of its operations.²⁴ The Church in her ordinary teaching adheres to this conclusion of philosophy but she has made no dogmatic pronouncement in the matter. She has indeed defined the creation of the human soul but she has not defined exactly how it is created, though the general tenor of her traditions is in favor of an immediate act of God.²⁵ This is particularly true with regard to the origin of the first human soul. From the standpoint of metaphysics it is difficult, if not impossible, to see how the soul, so superior in its powers to any material agent, could have been brought into existence by any activity short of divine causality acting directly. This is the common opinion of theologians which cannot be refuted by any convincing argument although the Church has not defined it as being *de fide*.²⁶

Neither has the Church defined anything with regard to the origin of the body of man other than its creation by God. Here again we may say that the accepted opinion holds to the doctrine of direct creation as being more probable;²⁷ but the Church has never condemned as heretical the teaching of those who, like St. George Mivart, held the opposite view,²⁸ though her theologians have frequently called attention to the weakness of the evidence upon which it is based. This is not to say, as some overzealous individuals have asserted, that we have absolutely no evidence for the evolution of the body of man. To do so would be to ignore the actual facts. I cannot here take the time to enumerate the arguments in favor of the supposition and much less to discuss their validity. Suffice it to say that Catholic investigators frankly admit the existence of many facts brought to light by the biological sciences, pointing to such an evolution; but in common with many scientists outside the Fold, they hold

²⁴ Cf. Dubray, Rev. Charles A., S.M., *Introductory Philosophy*, New York, 1913, pp. 469 ff.; also Moore, Dom Thomas Verner, *Dynamic Psychology*, Phila., 1924, pp. 402 ff.

²⁵ "The origin of the human soul can be explained only by an immediate act of creation. This proposition is 'theologically certain'—Creationism, therefore, is not merely a doctrine of some particular school, but a theologically certain truth, which no Catholic can deny without temerity."—Pohle-Preuss, *opus cit.*, pp. 171-177.

²⁶ "Creationism cannot be regarded as a dogma in the strict sense of the word."—*Idem*, p. 173.

²⁷ "The body of the first man as well as his soul were created immediately by God. This thesis may be technically qualified as '*sententia satis certa*.'"—*Idem*, p. 127.

²⁸ Tanqueray, Rev. A., "*Synopsis Theologiae Dogmaticae Specialis*." Paris, 1905, Vol. I, p. 327.

that the evidence thus far presented is merely circumstantial and by no means sufficient to constitute a proof.²⁹

I think it can be truly said, therefore, that the Catholic Church has assumed no positive attitude toward the theory of evolution as a scientific hypothesis. According to her teaching, God is the Creator of all things, visible and invisible. As to the method of that creation, she has made no pronouncement.³⁰ That she has acted wisely, no one familiar with the vagaries of scientific opinion will question. Scientific hypotheses come and go. They appear like new stars on the horizon of thought; their brilliance increases from day to day; and it is proclaimed with dogmatic assurance—not always, however, by their discoverers but generally by would-be popularizers of science—that in the light of their rays we shall be able to explore depths of the universe that were hitherto enveloped in the impenetrable darkness of mystery and doubt. But no sooner has the unthinking world accepted this dictum of the pseudo-scientists than word comes from another source—the researches of genuine science—that the new star has already begun to wane. Its splendor fades and soon its light is spent like that of the meteor that flashes across the night; and the world realizes that it has been diverted from the path of science in pursuit of another scientific will-o'-the-wisp. And so the Church, experienced observer that she is, adopts a conservative attitude towards these scientific pronouncements, neither blindly embracing them nor dogmatically condemning them. Her bearing is thus in strong contrast to that of many other organizations, both religious and political, that are thrown into a turmoil by every new announcement from the realm of science.³¹ The Church knows that if these hypotheses are correct

²⁹ I have not thought it necessary or advisable to introduce a discussion of the decrees of the Biblical Commission as I felt this would involve a question belonging to the study of exegesis for which I knew my audience was not prepared. I have been content, therefore, to point out to the best of my ability what the Church has declared to be *de fide* in the matter of creation and what her theologians hold generally concerning some of the moot questions not so defined. I have found current among students of the type I was addressing a sort of vaguely formulated opinion that the Church is opposed to the doctrine of evolution in any form and the purpose of my remarks was to remove this misapprehension, as I believe it to be, and to set before them as clearly as I could the fact that the Church hinders in no way but rather encourages her children to take an active interest in the pursuit of scientific truth.

³⁰ Windle, Sir Bertram, "Catholics and Darwin."

³¹ Cf. Hilaire Belloc, "The Catholic Freedom." Columbia, March, 1925.

they will stand the test of time and further experiment and she can afford to wait. She has no fear that scientific discovery will one day undermine the solid foundation of revealed truth upon which she has been built. Appropriating the thought of a non-Catholic writer, we may say that she rests secure in the conviction that "God is no hypocrite displaying one thing as truth in Nature and another thing as truth in Men. . . . There can be no reconciliation between scientific truth and religious truth, for there never was nor ever can be any disagreement."³² "Never," says the Vatican Council, "can there be a real conflict between faith and reason."

What, then, should be the position of the Catholic scientist on the question of evolution? Let it be noted that we are never asked what should be the attitude of the Catholic scientist toward the theory of relativity or the quantum theory of light. Yet, from the standpoint of science, there is no essential difference in the status of these various theories. They are all hypotheses put forward by those who believe that each in its respective field offers a more satisfactory explanation of actual phenomena than any other theory so far proposed. None of them commands unquestioned acceptance, for none of them has been sufficiently proved; yet each demands the careful attention and further study of every genuine observer, Catholic and non-Catholic alike, in the domain of science.³³ What should be the attitude of the Catholic scientist toward these various theories? For answer, ask the spirit of Stenson, of Haüy or of Spallanzani; of Copernicus, of Galvani or of Volta; of Pasteur, of Mendel or of Lavoissier; or of any of the great galaxy of Catholic experimenters of the past who have left their mark upon the science of today.³⁴ And if you are not satisfied with this answer from the spirit world, put the question to those still in the flesh: the priests, Wasmann, Dorlodot, Breuil, Obermaier and the Abbés Bouyssonie, or the laymen, Windle and Dwight. From one and all, the quick and the dead, you will receive the self-same answer: The Catholic scientist should approach his

³² Chancellor, W. E., "Motives, Ideals and Values in Education." Boston and New York, 1907, p. 321. Refers to White, "The Warfare Between Science and Theology," Vol. I, p. viii.

³³ Cf. O'Toole, Rev. G. B., "Evolution and Catholic Education." Bulletin of the Catholic Educational Association, November, 1924, p. 107.

³⁴ Windle, *Art. cit.*

study of nature with the single aim of attaining the truth, keeping an open mind that is willing to be convinced, weighing all the evidence and testing every hypothesis that promises a solution of the mystery that surrounds us and "welcoming every wise thought and every useful discovery, whatever its origin may have been."^{as} This is the only attitude that is compatible with his status as a scientist and a Catholic. As a scientist he should find the truth; as a Catholic he should claim that truth for God.

EDWARD B. JORDAN,
Catholic University of America.

^{as} Pope Leo XIII.

THE TEACHING FUNCTION OF THE CHURCH

If the Church is to win the modern world to Christ, it will only be by and through education. So essentially dependent on a knowledge and understanding of her doctrines is the acceptance of her world mission that final and anything like noteworthy success for her work is unthinkable unless men are taught her dogmas and trained to live the full life she presents to them. Christianity is not an emotional religion, nor is it a dry as dust philosophy. It is a vital pulsating belief which, taking into consideration the whole complex nature of man, makes its appeal to every side of him. A Christian, therefore, must be an educated man in the complete meaning of that word. His mind must be trained in the acceptance of the beliefs of the Church; his emotions must be purified and chastened; his will must reach out for and attain to the best and highest morality. That such an achievement is impossible without education must be evident on its mere statement. The very complexity, I may say infinity of the Christian ideal, makes constant striving towards its attainment the task of every believer. Nor can the individual be satisfied, no matter how complete his own achievement, until the truth of Christ is made to illumine the mind of every human being, until this truth in its fullness shall become the guiding star for nations as well as for every individual conscience.

The Church of Christ presents a very definite view of the world to our acceptance. She teaches the existence of God, the truth of the Trinity, of the Incarnation and Redemption by and through Jesus Christ. No less definite are her pronouncements concerning man, his origin and destiny, and the means he must take to secure salvation both for himself and for the society of which he is a part. Thus, the Christian view is essentially a *Welt-und-lebensanschauung*. But its acceptance involves a vision of truth and an aspiration towards virtue far beyond the unaided resources of human nature. And this acceptance can scarcely be brought about unless we assume that the Church is essentially an educator whose supreme task is to present to every type of mind and to secure, because of the logic and finality of her presentations, a convincing and whole-hearted adhesion to this view of life. The task of the Church, therefore, reveals to

us the supreme importance which she must ever place on education. To be true to her calling, she cannot but regard her mission as essentially educative. Nor should the outcome of her work be judged solely in terms of the success attained in the salvation of individual souls. It is as important for the Church to have influenced, and rightly, society as it is to bring individual men to Christ. For Christianity can never be satisfied as long as evil exists in this world, even if that be an evil of a group or community or nation, and not of professing Christians.

Her primary mission is, of course, to the individual soul. But the extent of the acceptance of the Kingdom of God amongst men and of its influence upon the thinking and activity of nations marks no less the success or failure of her task of religious education. The only satisfactory goal, therefore, which the Church may set for herself is one whose attainment seems impossible except by and through universal education. And in the totality with which she regards her function of education depend to no small degree the extent of her influence as a compelling factor in the experiences of nations and men, as well as the permanency of her life.

To speak of the Church as educator must appear to some a mere platitude. Such undoubtedly it would be if the term "education" had any constant meaning. But a new view of the process we call education has grown up during the past century, and a new understanding has come about of the forces latent therein. The modern school is as different from the old Roman school as modern warfare is from ancient fighting. Every age, too, has had books. But we possess printed books, and the power of reading was increased a thousandfold by the invention of printing. So, too, the present-day attitude has changed towards education because modern education, with its splendid equipment, teacher training, its democratic aspiration and increasing equalization of educational opportunity, has made our schools instruments of meaning and power far beyond what any other age could possibly have seen in them.

A new evaluation of the functions of the school is current amongst us, as well as a more correct estimate of its potentialities for good and evil. The Church is therefore called upon to adapt her philosophy and methods of education to the accepted tenets of the world today. She can disregard this instrument

for the deepening and broadening of her religious life only under pain of losing a great deal of the power which she still possesses over the minds of men. Civil governments have not been slow to see the immense possibilities of universal education. They have seized upon the school as the starting point for training the children of the nation in their theories and interpretations concerning man and his place in society. They have preached nationalism through the school and have succeeded, in more than one notable instance, in moulding whole populations along the lines laid down by a dominant political thought. As a matter of fact, in most countries the school exists primarily as an instrument for the indoctrinating of the nation in the aims and purposes of its accepted rulers.

The taking over by the state of the school and the widening of educational opportunity, the direct result of this step, is not in itself an evil. Viewed abstractly, much good might ensue both to the state and to the individual from such a control of education. In the concrete, however, state domination of education has brought about a condition of affairs wholly unacceptable to the believer in Christianity, for the reason that the state school has been put in the position of perpetuating a view of life which is fundamentally contrary to the Christian view. Secularism in education is now the accepted philosophy of every great nation of Europe and America, and this represents a viewpoint which, in many cases, is non-Christian, where it is not frankly anti-Christian. No matter what were the reasons which prompted modern statesmen to secularize the school, the outcome of such training is an affront to Christian principles, a deadening of Christian morality, and a defeat of Christian life. The Church can scarcely be asked to accept a system of education which spells her defeat, and eventually the overthrow of everything for which she has stood. In the educational field, therefore, the struggle must continue between the state and the Church until one or the other is willing to give up its pretensions to being the sole guide of mankind. That the state has up to this been more successful in imposing its viewpoint than the Church is no augury of final triumph.

The rise of nationalism in education presents one of the most startling developments of recent times. Many forces, such as the industrial revolution, the extension of suffrage to all classes.

the increasing democratization of society, worked towards a condition which made it easy for the modern state to monopolize education. These factors, however, do not explain the secularist trend which has always been a marked characteristic of the state school. Nor is it a sufficient explanation to assert that no modern state could afford to take upon itself the task of deciding which of the many conflicting forms of belief, which exist side by side in every country, should be taught in the school. The so-called "neutral" attitude, with which the state school started its educational work, has not been maintained. In its place, if it ever existed outside of a paper program, there has sprung up as a matter of settled scholastic policy a minimizing of the religious standpoint and a positive influence making for the denial of all religious beliefs and of every religious sanction. The net result of one hundred years of state monopoly of education has been the widespread acceptance of the Hegelian conception of the state, according to which philosophy the state is looked upon as supreme in all things, as the possessor of rights which no individual possesses, and in the exercise of which the state is answerable to no one. No less a thinker than Belloc has pointed out the destructive implications of the idea of the "slave state." That it is an ideal which is in open defiance to every principle which the Church of Christ has professed, no one can question who frankly faces the issues involved.

Modern France presents a picture of what we may expect if the idea of a state monopoly of education is permitted to triumph. The French school today is definitely ranged against religious education. Its whole spirit is "lay"; the teachers are state functionaries; the curriculum flaunts religious belief; it expressly stands for "lay" morality. If there is any Christianity today in France, after one hundred years of secularist education, it is due solely to the fact that the Church has not abdicated entirely her rôle of educator. Through the pulpit, her social and welfare organizations, and what schools she is allowed to conduct, the Church has kept alive the flame of religious belief in the French people. At this very hour she is fighting vigorously the extension of the "L'Ecole Unique" to the recovered provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. It is a struggle in which the whole Christian world cannot but wish her success.

Secularist education in other countries, it is true, has not pro-

duced such dire results from the religious angle as are evident in modern France. This is not due, however, to the fact that the secular school does not logically entail similar consequences, but for the reason that in these countries either the state did not vigorously push its claim to a monopoly of education or because the Christian influence was so strong that the state was compelled to compromise with the Church. However, the secularist philosophy of itself involves sad consequences for the Church. For no one can believe that a school, whose atmosphere is non-religious, shall produce in the child an attitude which accepts the claims of Christ upon him as of primary importance. The establishment in the child mind of a set of ideals which do not rise beyond succeeding in this world, which make of morality a matter of individual taste or convention, or which regard faith in God and in the mission of Our Lord to men as of secondary importance, can but mark the beginning of the end of a vigorous Christian life. Christianity can only with difficulty be taught to the child in a school whose whole influence is towards the idea that religion is a mere appendix of life or a superfluous accomplishment like the acquisition of a knowledge of music or of painting. If religion is to be made vital in the life of the adult, it must be taught to him as a child, not in any kind of a context, but in as advantageous a position as is given to any other subject of the school curriculum.

Religious educators are slowly arriving at this fundamental conviction. Surely, it is time. Religious education can never be anything more than a meaningless gesture if we expect it to influence deeply a child whose whole background has been such that he regards what he has learned in the secularized school as sufficient for all the purposes of life. Does this then mean that the state and Church must stand before each other as the proponents of rival systems of thought in education? For myself, I do not see how we can ever hope to reach a satisfactory solution of the impasse which has been reached unless both sides are willing to face the facts. The Church, in the very nature of the case, can scarcely be expected to play traitor to her divine mission here on earth. She cannot with reason be asked to abdicate her right to train men in morality and religion. This does not mean, however, that she cannot recognize the right of the state to carry on the education of the masses in secular knowledge.

The modern state, by the very nature of its constitution, is bound to supply all with the elements of education. It need not, however, conceive this function as contradictory to that of the Church. Neither need it use its tremendously superior economic position to push back the educational work of the Church to a state comparable to that of the days of the catacombs. On the contrary, a *modus vivendi* can be worked out which should be acceptable to the rival claims of each system. As long as her rights are safeguarded, the Church may reasonably be expected to go more than half way towards meeting the demands of the state. On its side, the modern state, if it is ready to approach the problem in a spirit of justice and fair play, can without question discover a means of satisfying all the legitimate aspirations of the Church.

What perhaps is more necessary than anything else at this time, as a preparation for a fair statement of the problem itself, is good-will on the part of both statesmen and churchmen. Extremists indeed may look upon a course of action which recognizes the claims of the Church as a supine abdication by the state of its just rights. But such a construction can only have weight with a person who regards Christianity as but one of many conflicting religions struggling for the attention of mankind. To us, on the other hand, who behold in the Church the final and complete revelation of God to man, there can be no question of a surrender on the part of the state. Quite the opposite. Give to the Church an opportunity, equal to that which the state possesses for its own educational work, of instilling into men's minds and hearts the living truth of Christ, and modern society will again feel itself based on a secure foundation and ready and able to move forward to even greater victories for the human spirit.

Has secularism in education assumed such proportions, in a century of development, that a policy which would recognize the teaching function of the Church has become unthinkable? As far as Continental Europe is concerned, with the exception of a few countries, it is only fair to state that there exists small hope of any of these governments ever recognizing the just claims of the Church, at least in the immediate future. The prospects, however, in the United States are much brighter. Here neither the state, school nor government itself has been

anti-Christian. If the public school has operated against Christianity, it has been because of the secular tendencies inherent in the system, not because of the anti-Christian principles of its supporters. In all probability the public school would never have developed along the lines which at present characterize it had the warring denominations of 1840 been able to agree on the course of its development. Sectarian jealousies at that time gave to the secularist educator both the opportunity and justification for initiating a system of schools from which not only every specific denominational belief was barred but from which Christianity itself was banished. Protestantism accepted this state of affairs. It is a very significant fact that today the Protestant churches are most loud in their condemnation of the secular spirit in education. Not only in theory do they recognize that education is the most important function of the Church, but, practically, they are promoting on all sides, by means of Sunday Schools, Vacation Bible Schools, Week Day Religious Instruction, and in other ways, the religious education of their constituencies.

The Catholic Church, on the contrary, never accepted either in theory or practice the secular school. Despite its poverty and the fewness of its members, it resolutely set out on a course of providing religious education in its own schools for every Catholic child. The result has been that the Church today is educating 2,500,000 children in 7,000 schools and colleges taught by upwards of 70,000 consecrated teachers. Nor has the state been unfriendly to these educational efforts by religious bodies, including the Catholic Church. On the contrary, the state has at all times protected and encouraged the Church in its educational functioning, conscious of the fact that the strongest and best American citizenship has come out of the church schools.

Now, if the state continues to manifest a friendly interest in religious education and the different religious bodies are a unit both in the assertion of the need of such education and in their resolution to provide it as far as they are able, why cannot it be possible to work out here in the United States a systematization of the educational problem which would be acceptable to all concerned? The mere suggestion of the possibility of such a development must strike the thoughtful observer as not only desirable in itself but as something towards which the construc-

tive forces of the Republic must unitedly look forward, as one of the greatest achievements of which we as a nation are capable.

Whatever the future may hold in store for the church schools, this much is certain—the Church itself must deepen and broaden its conception of what its educational mission to mankind entails, and must prepare itself to make even greater sacrifices in the cause of religious education than it has done heretofore. Fortunately, a new consciousness has arisen of the need of religious training for the masses. For democracy has brought into existence not only a recognition of the fact that all children should have an equal opportunity to be educated. It has also convinced us that every child has the right as a son of God to be educated religiously. The Church, therefore, must gird herself to meet in its widest reaches this popular demand for religious training. Never before did men so ardently desire the fruits which only a deep religious life can bring forth; never before have the nations looked forward with more hopeful expectancy to a condition wherein all men may live in peace and fellowship as it befits the members of a universal brotherhood. It is admitted on all sides today that mankind will never find salvation in education divorced from religion. Science has had its day. The secular school confesses its impotency before the moral and character problems of the individual and of the nation. The opportunity for the Church to step into the place thus left vacant in modern civilized life is a rare one indeed. Shall the Church be found wanting in the face of the golden privilege which now confronts her? As President Mackenzie has so aptly said: "The hour has struck for a fearless and complete study of the whole situation. The Church must conceive more thoroughly and more completely than it has ever done the work of religious education. It must investigate the breadth and depth of this work. It must discover and frankly describe the causes of its failure in the past. It must concentrate attention with a new and noble passion upon this work for the future." (Mackenzie, "The Church and Religious Education," p. 13.)

JAMES H. RYAN.

SUPERVISION IN THE CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL

In theory, the high school principal is held responsible for the improvement of instruction and his supervisory duties are accounted as being among his most important obligations. It is rightly held that supervision is needed, even in high school and academy, to unify the work of the school and to insure a high level of teaching efficiency. The high school has its share of new or young teachers, who stand in special need of helpful guidance and who may sometimes be prevented from failure through such guidance on the part of the principal. As one writer has expressed it, it is the principal's "first business to prevent failures, on the one hand, and to encourage growth, on the other." To adopt the college attitude by assuming that each high school teacher is a specialist competent to conduct the affairs of his department without interference, or to rest the case on the theory that high school instruction is too technical for any one person to supervise, is equally to miss the mark. These assumptions are nevertheless frequently made, and it therefore happens that supervision in high school, whether public or private, is conspicuous mainly by its absence. Our practice does not harmonize with our theory.

The evidence for the neglect of supervision in public high schools is abundant enough, but we are here concerned with the Catholic high school. The frequent staff meetings held in some Catholic high schools and academies, and the ease with which a small group of teachers living as a religious community can discuss teaching problems, would seem to argue that supervision, at least of an informal character, must be more prevalent among Catholic schools. This expectation, however, does not appear to be borne out by the results obtained by questioning the teachers themselves. In a study of neglected tasks of high school administration made last summer at the University of Notre Dame, and reported in this journal last November¹ supervision was ranked at the top of the list of neglected tasks. Curriculum reorganization was ranked second on the list, and the conducting of effective teachers' meetings was ranked third. Teachers'

¹ "Neglected Tasks in High School Administration," in *CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL REVIEW*, Vol. 22, pp. 540-45 (November, 1924).

meetings are, of course, an agency for the improvement of instruction, and the place on the list attained by this item reinforces the agreement as to the neglect of supervision.

Why does supervision tend to be neglected? Catholic teachers themselves assign several causes, namely: (1) Lack of time due to the principal's carrying an excessive teaching and administrative load; (2) unwillingness or incapacity of principals to assume the responsibilities of supervision; (3) failure of teachers to understand the purposes of supervision with a resultant unwillingness to submit to it.

As far as the neglect of supervision is due to wrong attitudes there should be no great difficulty in bringing about a change for the better. Explanation, tact and demonstration of results will succeed in changing wrong attitudes on the part of the individual teacher, and instances of opposition on the part of an entire staff are probably very rare. The unwillingness and incapacity of principals is a more difficult problem, to be solved only by the pressure of teachers' expressed desires and by attendance upon a course in supervision at some university. The principal who has been awakened to the need of supervision can, of course, do much to equip himself by reading and by a study of the local situation. The available literature on supervision is, naturally enough, concerned chiefly with the supervisory problems and techniques of the elementary school, but specific treatment of high school supervisory problems are to be found in the annual *Yearbooks* of the National Association of Secondary School Principals and in the pages of the *School Review* and the *American School Board Journal*. Nutt's "The Supervision of Instruction" (Houghton Mifflin Co., 1920) considers high school as well as elementary problems.

The task of training high school principals for the more effective exercise of their supervisory obligations has hardly been begun, and its importance cannot be overstated. Our schools and departments of education should be doing more in this respect than they are. Still, this is largely their problem, and the more immediate difficulty for the average principal is that involved in lack of time to devote to the supervision of instruction. It is with this practical problem that we shall try to deal in some detail.

We have no statistics on the number of Catholic principals

who are free of teaching duties, but such evidence as we have indicates that the number is not a large one. We have other evidence to show that some principals carry as heavy a teaching load as any teacher on their staff. In between these two extremes lie the cases of principals who carry one-third, one-half or two-thirds of a full teaching load. Consequently, the problem of securing time for supervision is a variable, but probably a pressing one for the majority of Catholic principals. The devices that can be used to increase supervision will likewise vary in degree of availability, according as we are considering principals with much, little or no free time from teaching.

Let us first take the case of the principal engaged in full-time teaching. Regular classroom visitation is out of the question, but occasional visitation can be arranged for. Thus, it is often practicable for the principal to give his own class a written lesson which can be taken care of by the teacher in charge of the study hall, leaving him free to visit the class of some teacher in need of guidance. The main reliance of the principal with a full teaching load must, however, be placed on other devices than occasional visitations and conferences, and it is at this point that a distinction will help us.

Supervision may be direct or it may be indirect. Direct supervision involves the employment of classroom visitation, "follow-up" conferences, and demonstration teaching as its principal devices. Indirect supervision involves the use of certain administrative devices which condition and control the work of the classroom without demanding the presence of a supervisory officer. In a broad sense, every administrative technique that helps to set the stage for effective teaching has a supervisory aspect, inasmuch as it assists in the improvement of instruction. Thus, classifying pupils into homogeneous groups certainly is a device resulting in better instruction; so, too, are the planning of a schedule so as to conserve energy through a wise sequence of teaching assignments involving a minimum of class preparations, the selection of subject-matter and textbooks, and the providing of necessary materials and equipment.

More pointedly, indirect supervision is exercised through the setting up of definite standards and goals for instruction, with the subsequent testing of the results achieved. The pupil's performance is a test of the teacher as well as of the pupil. If

the principal carries through a testing program, preferably through objective tests, and then takes the trouble to arrange the results on a comparative basis, and in that form bring them to the attention of his teachers, he will have plenty of material for emphasizing the improvement of instruction. This will be all the more helpful if diagnostic tests are included in his testing program. They will indicate specific weaknesses and definite objectives for further instruction. The much abused "faculty meeting" will become under such circumstances a genuine agency for promoting teachers' professional advancement. Getting teachers to read professional literature becomes an easy task when specific weaknesses are uncovered and when there is a felt need for drawing upon the experience and counsels of other teachers and other schools. Test results, supplemented by the information that comes to the principal from students and from other sources, will furnish him with data for personal conferences with his teachers. When to these devices of indirect supervision are added the occasional classroom visitation, it is plain that the principal engaged in teaching is not so helpless in the face of his supervisory obligations as might be supposed.

Important and helpful as are the devices of indirect supervision, they do not and cannot furnish an equivalent substitute for regular classroom visitation. Fundamentally, indirect supervision has the same weakness as indirect evidence, and is liable to the same misunderstandings and false interpretations. The principal anxious to improve instruction will wish to supplement his use of tests and staff meetings by the first-hand evidence obtained from actual visitation.

If actual visitation is really as important as it is generally conceded to be, it follows that provision should be made for it even at some sacrifice. A vital point of attack is the teaching load of the principal himself, since it is that burden which stands in the way of direct supervision. Is this teaching load really necessary, and can it be reduced so as to make room for visitation?

The solution of this problem leads us to the broader problem of curriculum planning, and here we can perhaps take a hint from the experience of the public high schools. State departments of public instruction have noted a tendency among small high schools to offer too ambitious a program of studies.

Courses have been added in order to make a more favorable showing in comparison with the larger city schools, as, for example, in the modern languages. The State of Indiana is discouraging its small high schools from offering foreign languages other than Latin on the ground that one foreign language is all that the small school can offer without unduly adding to the teaching load. Both Indiana and Ohio are encouraging small schools to alternate such courses as can be taught profitably by that method, thereby decreasing the teaching load for any one year while at the same time permitting of a fair number of elective courses. General science is alternated annually with biology, community civics with early European history, algebra with commercial arithmetic, and so forth. It is possible that some Catholic high schools might well consider either reducing the curriculum or alternating certain courses in order to reduce the principal's teaching load. It is the small high school that usually overburdens the principal, and it is also the small high school that attempts an ambitious and excessive program of studies. Reduction would work a benefit in both directions.

In the larger public high schools, and perhaps also among a few Catholic high schools, it is not the teaching but rather the administrative load that prevents the principal from carrying out a policy of regular classroom visitation. Office routine, building inspection, conferences with pupils and callers, and many other administrative matters cut deeply into the time of the principal in charge of a large modern school. Insufficiently provided with clerical help, such a principal often faces a practical dilemma, namely, whether to carry out an efficient administration at the expense of supervision or to neglect the work of administration in order to find time to do the work of a supervisory nature that needs to be done. Since those in financial authority are not likely to realize nor to provide for the needed clerical assistance, what solution is there for the dilemma just outlined?

Various plans of meeting the problem have been offered or given a trial. The most thorough-going is that of making an analysis of the principal's duties in order to discover those tasks which can be delegated either in whole or in part to clerks or teachers, thus saving time for supervision. H. D. Fillers offered such an analysis in the *School Review* for January, 1923, divid-

ing the principal's managerial duties into curricular and extra-curricular, and subdividing each class into clerical, general-in-control, and inspectorial and coordinating duties. A detailed list of duties was then compiled under each head, and the several lists studied to discover which ones could be delegated to a clerk or to teachers and which ones the principal must perform personally. It was found that many of the duties in the general control of the school to be performed by the principal personally are completed by the end of the second week after the opening of any semester, and of the others, that many can satisfactorily be delegated in whole or in part. A similar analysis could be made by any principal and in all probability would reveal ways of saving time, even if not to the extent found by Mr. Fillers.

The Roosevelt High School of Alton, Illinois, has tried the experiment of appointing certain of the teachers as head assistants, each in charge of a particular school activity, such as credit administration, extra-curricular activities, the school library, athletics, etc. The head assistants were given about two-thirds of the normal teaching load and an increase in salary by way of compensation. The effect of the plan was to relieve the principal of much detail work and to permit of his doing much more supervision.² A similar plan is reported from the West High School at Akron, Ohio, where the administrative work of the school is divided up among an assistant principal, a dean of girls, a director of extra-curricular activities, a director of attendance, a head for each department represented in the curriculum, and the teachers generally.³ Both plans cited are fairly elaborate, of course, and could not be adopted in their entirety, but they do suggest that any fair-sized high school can work out an administrative organization embodying the principle of delegated responsibility. The delegation of administrative authority, if not overdone, has the further value of bringing teachers into participation in administration in ways helpful to their professional advancement and satisfying to their natural desire to take part in the larger tasks of high-school education. If too little of this has been done in the past, the reason has not been so much

²B. C. Richardson: "Faculty Organization in the Theodore Roosevelt High School," in *School Review*, November, 1920.

³E. E. Morley: "The Supervision of Instruction," in *Educational Research Bulletin*, Ohio State University, September 17, 1924.

the reluctance or incapacity of teachers as the unwillingness of principals to delegate authority, and their content in being the office type of principal who prefers pushing electric buttons and dictating letters to supervise classroom instruction.

To summarize, there is evidence to show that supervision is neglected in Catholic as well as in public high schools, and our problem is to discover causes and suggest remedies for this apparent neglect. Three causes have been suggested, which we have taken up in reverse order. Wrong attitudes toward supervision on the part of teachers are a matter to be dealt with by tactful explanation and effective demonstration of results. Incapacity of principals to supervise instruction may be overcome by study, either on the job or in attendance upon a university course in supervision. The alleged lack of time for supervision, due to the principal's carrying an excessive teaching or administrative load, is the cause most often given as explaining current neglect. The principal with a full teaching load can, however, arrange for occasional visitation of the classroom and has furthermore at his command all the resources available through indirect supervision, of which the most important are the testing of results from instruction, the use of the staff meeting to discuss weaknesses disclosed by testing, and the encouragement of professional reading among his teachers. The teaching load of the principal may be reduced by eliminating superfluous courses from a too ambitious program of studies and by alternating certain courses from year to year. The administrative load may be reduced by working out an administrative organization embodying the principle of delegated authority, following a careful analysis of the principal's actual duties and responsibilities.

LEIGH G. HUBBELL, C.S.C.

School of Education,
University of Notre Dame.

EDUCATION IN PALESTINE

The laying of the foundation stone for the Jewish University at Jerusalem by Lord Balfour has drawn the attention of the world to the educational question in the Holy Land. During the last five years the arrangements for education in Palestine have entered into a new phase, and it may therefore not be amiss at this stage to give a short description of its past and its present state.

I. PALESTINE ELEMENTARY EDUCATION IN THE PAST

The two chief characteristics of Palestine education in the past, arising from the utter indifference of the Turkish authorities towards it, were on the one hand the neglect of it by the greater part of the population, on the other hand the fullest liberty on the part of those who desired or offered education. Arabic, the native language of the country, was despised by the Turkish administration, who used their own native tongue for official purposes; and it will therefore not surprise us that, in most of the schools conducted by foreigners, their own language was the medium of instruction, whilst Arabic had to take a back seat. Even the Catechism was often taught in a foreign tongue. That under these conditions many of the teaching religious in Palestine never felt it a duty to make themselves familiar with the mother tongue of their scholars was regrettable, but intelligible.

There have been for a number of years elementary schools in all the towns and in some villages. The secular Missions of the Catholic Patriarchate, which are all situated in villages of Palestine or Transjordan, always had schools added to them. It is, however, unfortunate that the native or foreign Sisters who teach the girls cannot also take charge of the boys in the smallest schools, owing to the want of respect towards women in general on the part of the boys. Schismatics or even Mohammedans in small villages not seldom send their children to these parish schools. In some places there are schools for Mohammedans or Schismatics taught by natives, but in the past some of them confined themselves to reading from their sacred books. Of course the Jews are best provided with elementary schools for

different reasons: First of all they always settled together in large numbers; secondly they valued education more than their neighbors; finally they received financial support from outside. Yiddish for social, and Hebrew for religious purposes formed part of their curriculum.

The schools of foreign religious are to be found in all the towns where there is a large number of Christians, and most of them go beyond the elementary grade. French schools are in the majority and are conducted either by the Brothers of Saint John de la Salle or by Sisters. Italian Brothers and Sisters usually teach in the parish schools of the towns, which are under the parochial charge of the Franciscan Fathers. German Sisters of Saint Charles Boromeo have only a few schools, which are remarkable by the fact that they make Arabic the language for instruction. The same was the case with a number of village boy schools in Galilee, managed and supervised by the German Lazarists but taught by native secular masters, whom the Fathers themselves trained and who were maintained by the Catholic Palestine Society of Germany. The war, alas, has destroyed these schools, and at the same time the training of secular masters for Catholic schools has come to an end. As things are at present this work can only be restarted by means of foreign money and English-speaking teachers either from America or Ireland. How important it will be in the future will appear when we come to speak of elementary education at the present time.

Before taking leave of the schools of foreign religious it will be well to state that a great many of their pupils live in orphanages or other institutions. Chief amongst the latter are the agricultural school and the trades schools of the Salesians of Dom Bosco. Their work is all the more valuable, because the Arabs of Palestine are more inclined to a superficial learning of foreign languages than to manual work; but only the latter will make them sturdy and self-relying Catholics. The orphanages for girls also teach useful housework, but female education amongst the lower classes usually comes to an early close by a marriage at the age of 14 to 16 years, even amongst Catholics.

Some Protestant sects from America, England and Germany also have elementary schools either in their settlements as the Templars, or in their orphanages for native children.

II. PALESTINE ELEMENTARY EDUCATION AT PRESENT

For the last five years, i.e., since the English civil administration under the Mandate, elementary education has been gradually organized. In the first place a Department of Education was established, the head of which is a Cambridge graduate, who has gained much experience as a government official in Egypt. Existing schools (also Catholic Mission schools) which undertook to teach at least Arabic and arithmetic received a small government grant. Last year another condition was added, viz., the admission of a government inspector for occasional visits. English is not prescribed, although it is the chief official language, but there is everywhere a great desire to learn it.

Places without schools or short of educational facilities are supplied with teachers by the government if they provide a suitable building and give a small contribution. The untrained teachers appointed by the government are examined and are paid according to their passing either the higher or only the lower examination. In both of them the practical precedes the theoretical test, and only those candidates who show sufficient teaching capacity are allowed to sit for the written examination.

In the syllabus of government schools it is forbidden to teach any foreign language, until the child has learned Arabic for at least three years; this is a very wise provision, for the town Arab wants to get a smattering of the different European languages, so that he can make an easy living as a guide whilst there are tourists or pilgrims; for the rest of the year he will rely on the benefactions of his clergy.

A great step in the promotion of elementary education was the erection of a training college for masters in Jerusalem. Promising youths of any religion or none, who pass an entrance examination, are trained and maintained for three years on condition that they will take a post in a public or recognized school for five years. Religion is not a compulsory subject, but facilities are given to the ministers of the different religions to give instruction to the trainees of their own creed. A similar arrangement for the training of female teachers has been made in connection with the English High School for girls in Jerusalem. In both institutions the candidates for the teaching profession must be boarders, so that they may benefit by the intercourse with their fellow students.

III. HIGHER EDUCATION

At present there is no public money available for higher studies; therefore collegiate or secondary education depends upon charity or private enterprise. An example of the latter is the above mentioned English High School for girls, run by a committee of English residents and officials. On a similar basis rests the Anglican College of Saint George, attached to the Anglican Cathedral, and partly staffed by the clergy of the latter.

The Jews have their higher schools in the large towns. They lay great stress on manual training for boys and girls side by side with literary education, for they know that in places where they live in large numbers, they cannot exist by trade alone.

The foreign Catholic schools usually give also some courses of advanced education, especially the "French Frères" (as they are called) in their colleges at Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Jaffa, Haifa and Nazareth. Many of their pupils are Schismatics or Mohammedans.

So far each kind of institution has worked on its own lines, without a common standard or syllabus. In consequence of this the different school certificates gave no clue as to the knowledge and capacity of their holders. In order to secure a common standard and to supply the youths of Palestine, who wanted to enter the learned professions with a recognized diploma, admitting them to the universities, the Education Department has established an official examination by a board the members of which are representatives of the Education Department and the different collegiate institutions. They have prescribed a syllabus on the lines of the English Matriculation scheme, which is to be followed in an annual examination, to which anyone can be admitted, and for the passing of which official diplomas are granted. As there are in Palestine three official languages, Arabic, English and New Hebrew, the examination can be in either of them.

A word must here be said of New Hebrew. It is one of the aims of the Zionist movement, that the Jews in Palestine should speak to each other in their national language. But as for many modern objects and ideas no terms exist in the old tongue, Hebrew has been brought up to date, and there exists a dictionary, which has worked out the problem on scientific lines. The language is taught in nearly all the Jewish schools, and also

adults, under the pressure of the Zionists, are trying to learn it. The pretension of the majority of the Jews at the last census, that it is their mother tongue, does not, however, correspond with facts, for many speak still Yiddish, and sometimes they have to fall back on German.

IV. UNIVERSITY EDUCATION

Much has been said and written about the future universities in Palestine. University education there has great obstacles to overcome; for in that poor country there is not much money for the purpose and not much scope for university men, especially as the learned professions are already overcrowded by natives and immigrants. Then there is not sufficient unity amongst the inhabitants so as to bind them together for collaboration. On the other hand, the idea of erecting three universities—one for Moslems, one for Christians and one for Jews—seems out of the question, both from the point of finance as well as from that of the number of students in a backward country of less than a million inhabitants. There is, besides, the competition with the French Jesuit and the Protestant American universities of Beirut, which have already secured good reputations, especially in their medical faculties. A law faculty for Palestine will be useless, for there exists already a recognized legal corporation of existing lawyers, which has the exclusive charge of the legal studies and of the admission to the profession; and as the latter is already considerably overcrowded the examinations are very stiff.

The Milan Society of Saint Paul or the "Opera Cardinal Ferrari" came three years ago to Jerusalem with the idea of starting an Arab, as distinguished from the Jewish University. By opening preparatory courses they found their pupils insufficiently advanced for a university course, and also the numbers very small, so that they will probably hesitate this year to start more than one faculty, viz., that of Arabic literature and other oriental languages. So far the excellent school of Biblical Archeology and Semitic languages, conducted by the French Dominicans, has not been affiliated to the new Italian venture, and it too suffers from want of students. The other archeological institutes serve more the purposes of research and excavation than as educational establishments.

Finally we come to the Jewish University, It is to be the center of Jewish literature, of ancient and modern Hebrew, of Old Testament studies and of Rabbinical theology for the Jewry of the whole world. At the same time modern science with opportunities for research is to have an important position. Therefore Dr. Eppstein and other famous scientists have received calls to assist in the work and two small laboratories have been at work for several years. Jewish scholars of different nationalities have been engaged to write manuals on their particular subjects, some of which have already appeared in the national tongues of the writers, but are to be translated into New Hebrew, so that by this means a fixed terminology may be secured for the future university lectures.

Lord Balfour's laying of the foundation stone was not an official act on behalf of the British Government but a moral contribution by an enthusiastic and idealistic well-wisher of modern Jewish aspirations. His act has certainly not facilitated the difficult task of the British administrators in Palestine, although the latter prevented actual hostilities in the Holy Land. The purpose of those who invited Lord Balfour was undoubtedly a very practical one. Much Jewish money has already been spent on buying and improving land for Jewish colonies, and a great deal more will be needed. It can only come from England and America, but the contributions so far were less generous than was expected. Now a new claim comes on behalf of a university, and in order to stimulate afresh the American Jews, and to wake up the less willing English and French brethren, a great and venerable English statesman and philosopher is enticed to go to Palestine, to speak enthusiastically on the great venture, and to lay a second foundation stone on Mount Scopus. The success of the ambitious scheme will chiefly depend upon the impression which the noble lord has made on well-to-do Israel in the dispersion, for there is no lack of enthusiasm amongst its promoters in Palestine.

LAMBERT NOLLE, O.S.B.,

Late Vice-Rector of the Latin Patriarchal Seminary.
Weingarten Abbey, Germany.

THE CLASSICAL INVESTIGATION

PART ONE, GENERAL REPORT—*Continued*

Very naturally the greatest disagreements with the General Report arise with the specific recommendations of the investigators, especially those which, so far as I can ascertain, are the personal views of the investigators, or at any rate not the results of a general survey of competent opinion. I shall select such remarks from the chapters on content and method as seem worthy of further consideration, and shall treat them approximately in the order of their appearance in the report.

Among the general recommendations (pp. 123-124) I object to the last part of number five, "That practice in writing Latin be continued throughout the first, second, and third years. It may well be omitted from the work of the fourth year in order to allow full time for the reading." I have seen no arguments advanced in the report which would induce me to recede from what you may call an old-fashioned view that practice in writing a language is the best preparation to reading its literature. The ability to write a foreign language is the best index of the pupils' knowledge; in this alone there can be no "bluff." But let us profit by the experiences of the past. In the Reverend R. Schwickerath's work "Jesuit Education" (St. Louis, 1903, p. 509 f.) we read:

It is known that, after the Berlin Conference of 1890, Latin lost fifteen hours a week in the nine classes of the gymnasium. The Latin compositions particularly were reduced considerably, almost completely abolished. What was the result? Very soon complaints were heard from all sides that in consequence of these changes the teaching of Latin had been greatly injured. It became evident that more extensive writing of Latin was necessary to obtain the linguistic and logical training of the mind, which is one of the foremost objects of Latin instruction. Only these exercises, the practical application of the rules of etymology and syntax, the careful examination of the peculiarities of style in the higher classes, and constant comparison with the mother-tongue, by means of translations and retranslations, give a thorough knowledge and insight into the language.

. . . Experience soon forced the German authorities to revert to what had been thrown overboard. In 1895 permission was granted to add one hour weekly in the higher classes, which was

to be devoted to practice in writing and to the application and repetition of rules of grammar and style. For, as Professor Fries declared, the curtailing of these exercises had proved to be the weakest point of the changes made after 1890. In the second conference, in 1900, the opinion of the most distinguished scholars was most positive in demanding a further strengthening of these exercises. It was proposed that a Latin composition should again be required for the last examination.

Thus in the General Report, far from a curtailment of the amount of "composition" accomplished at present in our high schools, I looked at least for specific recommendations for its improvement and possibly a suggestion that it be allotted additional time.

Another general recommendation (one) involves the spreading of the elements of Latin, now usually studied in the first year, over the entire period of four years. I do not see how any work of real Latin can be approached intelligently without a rather comprehensive knowledge of both forms and syntax. This will be discussed at greater length later in another connection.

Other general recommendations seem to overstress easy Latin and the use of made Latin, and if followed completely would result in the high school pupils having very little acquaintance with "real" Latin. No matter how much of a classical veneer modern Latin may have, it cannot replace the Latin masterpieces for school purposes.

Recommendation seven urges greater freedom of choice for the Latin teachers in the selection of the authors read. The College Board permits considerable freedom already, and I cannot see how much more can be allowed without, first, demoralizing the aim of secondary school Latin (however well intentioned the school teacher may be), and, secondly, without encountering the very practical difficulty of procuring suitable textbooks and not entailing prohibitive expense.

Professor Lodge in the *Classical Journal* of November, 1924 (pp. 78 ff.), thinks that on the basis of real worth the majority of teachers will still prefer Caesar. He also lends his support to the retention of the four Catilinarians in preference to substituting for them any of Cicero's other orations. He says, "To one holding, as I do, that Cicero's great value is as the last defender and martyr of the Constitution, the inclusion of

speeches that do not serve to interpret that attitude of his is a mistake."

In discussing the character of the "easy Latin" to be read (pp. 126 f.), much stress is placed on the quality of the English of the translation. If the pupil has had the proper training in the fundamentals of Latin and sufficient practice in translating, the teacher will have little difficulty in maintaining a decent standard of English, provided, of course, the pupil has also had the proper previous training in English. So much talk about the poor English in the Latin classroom and blaming the Latin teacher for it is "barking up the wrong tree." The main trouble lies with the earlier English training. We can do much to make up for the lack of fundamental knowledge of English expression and composition, but we must not be expected to do all.

On pages 137 f. and 142 are given the results obtained from a wide application, at the end of the second semester, of the Godsey test in the syntax of the verb, the Pressey test in the syntax of the noun, pronoun, and adjective, and the Tyler-Pressey test in verb forms. The generally poor results obtained are taken as conclusive proof that all the fundamentals of Latin should not be treated in the first year as is usually done today. The publication of the "Documentary Evidence" will indicate perhaps how widely and where these tests were given. Again we may have here an indication of faulty previous training in English. In any case if the statistics given represent an actual state of affairs throughout the country, then surely a remedy must be found. I agree that the importance of the various portions of the grammar in understanding Latin alone should decide how soon we should introduce them in the Latin course, and by this same token I do not see how a teacher can neglect much given in the first year book before he introduces his pupils to real Latin. The admonition that the teaching of certain forms and principles may be postponed but need not be entirely ignored until they are formally taught does not remedy matters at all. If pupils do not learn such portions of the grammar now in the regular first-year course, when teachers are exerting all their efforts to that end, they certainly will profit little by an informal treatment. Accordingly the distribution of the fundamentals of the grammar throughout the four-year course as specifically recommended on pp. 157-162 seems to me very

unsound. We are to leave until the fifth and sixth semesters: the dative with adjectives, dative of agent, ablative of comparison, ablative of degree of difference, locative, subjunctive in a *cum* clause of concession, subjunctive in a relative clause of description (characteristic), subjunctive in a substantive clause of fact with *ut*, passive periphrastic, and the subjunctive in present and past conditions contrary to fact. In the seventh and eighth semesters we are to teach the genitive with adjectives, genitive with verbs of remembering and forgetting, genitive with impersonal verbs, double accusative with verbs of making, historical infinitive, subjunctive in wishes, and the subjunctive expressing possibility, obligation, etc.

Under these restrictions I do not see how students could be expected by themselves to prepare the translation of any real Latin before late in the sixth semester or third year. I can understand how it could be undertaken earlier if done under the supervision of the teacher in class. Otherwise I feel that beginners would develop very slovenly habits of translation, using their intuition much more than their powers of reason.

But let us examine the distribution of the forms in certain semesters. The imperative of all conjugations present active second singular and plural is to be learned in the first semester, but we are *not* to study until the fourth semester the pronouns *aliquis* and *quisque*, the irregularities in the conjugation of *possum*, *eo*, *fero*, *volo*, *nolo* and *malo*, deponent verbs of all conjugations, future passive participle (gerundive) of all conjugations and the principal parts of selected verbs, and in the fifth semester locative case, future perfect indicative active and passive of all conjugations, the supine, and principal parts of selected verbs.

Once more the old question: What classical author can be studied by our classes before the latter part of the third year, except under the immediate supervision of the teacher? It may be true that few master these forms very early under the present manner of study, or at least not well enough to pass certain tests, but the great majority of those who have any real ability to profit from an extended period of Latin study do acquire an early working knowledge of these forms; by this I mean a sufficiently accurate conception of them to be able to acquire, by their own efforts, the exact information necessary.

To pass to a remark of less importance on page 175, we read:

It is probably not too much to say that the practice of depending solely or largely on the translation of a passage to test the pupil's preparation of the passage without giving him adequate assistance or training in preparation of the advance assignment is in large measure responsible for the frequent use of illegitimate helps in the study of Latin.

With this I also do not agree. The use of the "pony" in most cases results from a lack in moral training over which the Latin classroom can have at most but slight control. Home influences, and other local environment, as well as an early acquisition of bad habits of study have far more to do with the use of the "pony" than the failure of the teacher "to go over the new assignment." In fact, I can name schools where the regular practice is to go over carefully the entire translation for the next lesson, and I dare say that the use of illegitimate helps is as flagrant there as in any other school known to me. And again, the widespread use of the "pony" is no longer confined to the ancient classics. The teachers of modern languages are having their troubles also in this regard. Perhaps it is the spirit of the age!

We find a great deal said in the report about English derivatives (p. 183 ff.). My own experience with this phase of Latin teaching has been rather disappointing. I have found that English derivatives are very useful for fixing certain forms, but unless restricted to the very obvious words they tend to create confusion and discouragement. Correlating Latin with English has its value, of course, but it also can be carried too far in the matter of learning Latin. Here again I am glad to quote the report of the "Syllabus Committee" of the New York Classical Club (l. c.):

Throughout the course, less stress should be laid than at present on derivation work. This work, further, should be so directed as to be helpful to the student in his understanding of Latin rather than of his mother tongue.

Throughout the report great stress is laid on outside reading in English. This emphasis seems opportune because of the present tendency to neglect any background of knowledge to the authors read. It strikes me, however, that much of this reading could be arranged as prescribed work in the departments

of English and History. This would first of all assure a sufficient amount of it being done, and would save a little more time for real Latin.

In the recommendations for teaching vocabulary (pp. 206 ff.) one very important matter seems to have been neglected by the investigators and the teachers investigated as well. In the sharp attack upon the pupil who turns immediately to his vocabulary without a thought of the form he is to look for, no mention has been made of the proper use of a vocabulary, or, better still, of the intelligent use of a dictionary. "Associating a new Latin word with English derivatives or with related Latin words before the word is met in a sentence," and "Determining the meaning of a new Latin word from context, association with English derivatives or association with related Latin words as the new word is met in a sentence" is all very well, but again only under the immediate supervision of the teacher. If practiced alone by the pupil who does not know how to check this process by a careful use of the vocabulary or dictionary, it will lead to sorry results. Perception cards, "spell-downs" and the like are also useful to a certain extent, but if carried to excess will give our pupils very mistaken notions of the meaning of some very common Latin words, because the habit is acquired thereby of giving a single meaning to all words, even such words as *fero*, *ratio*, *res*, *pars*, etc. I cannot get away from the belief that the fundamental process in learning vocabulary is a knowledge of how to handle, first, the vocabulary at the back of the book, and before the end of the high school course the Harper's Lexicon. All other methods are auxiliary to this.

As you read the report continuously from the beginning, and meet the repeated admonitions to begin the reading of Latin early, and to teach the fundamentals of the grammar gradually from Latin and not before they are met in the context, you gradually begin to realize that you have in the report a revival of the so-called "Inductive Method." Something new has been added in the way of correlation with other subjects, and special stress on outside reading in English, but the backbone of the thing is the same. You are convinced of this when you read on page 219 ff.:

We recommend in particular that the learning of a formal rule of syntax be postponed until the pupil has encountered the

principle involved in his actual reading and has already informally identified the grammatical idea and observed the way in which it is expressed in Latin. A "rule" then becomes a formulation of his own experience that a certain idea is to be expressed in a certain way.

Professor Bennett in his "The Teaching of Latin in the Secondary School" (New York, 1917), has presented serious objections to this method, when carried to an extreme, for both forms and syntax. Briefly, it causes a great deal of floundering and waste of time.

We read also (p. 224 f.) that too much emphasis is being placed on questions in formal syntax, and that the common practice of asking such questions *after* the translation of the passage has been given is especially open to objection. To be sure insistence on the exact quotation of a rule is open to criticism, but I see absolutely no objection to the practice of questioning a pupil as to the reasons for his interpretation of a passage of Latin. If an intelligent expression of the linguistic principle is demanded, regardless of the exact wording of that principle as stated in the grammar, the pupil will learn that translation or interpretation, in order to be accurate and acceptable, must be supported at every point by sound reasoning. Then, too, we have already admitted that the "pony" is being widely used, and this sort of cross-examination is with some pupils about the last scruple in the way of a most vicious use of such illegitimate helps.

Finally, on pages 223 and 229 f. we are treated to a rather novel way of teaching the declensions and conjugations. A quotation from page 230 will give a general idea of the method recommended:

The similarities of inflectional endings in the various declensions and conjugations should be emphasized in the initial stages of the work and their differences taken up later. For example, pupils should be able to recognize the accusative singular of a masculine or feminine noun irrespective of the particular declension to which it may belong and to recognize the present and imperfect tenses of all regular conjugations before the four conjugations have been taken up separately.

Frankly I think such a treatment of the forms would lead to confusion. I much prefer the suggestion of L. W. P. Lewis in his "Practical Hints on the Teaching of Latin" (Macmillan, 1919),

that each declension and conjugation should be learned *in toto* first; then should follow an intensive drill on the single forms; and finally, as new declensions and conjugations are learned, these should be compared carefully with those that have preceded.

Such, then, are the main points of the report which call for more study and discussion. As I have said before, this is not much in an extensive work of this character, but nevertheless worthy of thought.

Again, I recommend every teacher of Latin to procure a copy of the General Report. Let him read it carefully, with the remarks written above, if you will, as a salutary antidote here and there.

ROY J. DEFERRARI.

CLASSICAL SECTION

This section aims first of all to act as a bureau of information for teachers of the Classics, particularly those of Catholic schools. Questions sent to me will be answered in these columns or by personal letter, or they will be turned over to persons fully equipped to give them proper consideration. It aims also to keep its readers informed of the most important movements and events in the world of the Classics, especially such as have bearing on the teaching of Latin and Greek in secondary schools.

Notes on Ecclesiastical Latin (Continued)

II. Cases

3. Dative.

The adjectives *dignus* and *indignus* regularly take the ablative in classical Latin. These words frequently take the dative in the popular language, and examples are frequent in inscriptions and ecclesiastical writers. E.g., *ab hoc iusta et honesta et auditui eius condigna deposcimus*. It may be that the analogy of the dative with *aptus* and *idoneus* facilitated this construction.

From the first century of the Christian era, the dative replaced another case used with a preposition after verbs of "union," "approach," "hostility," etc. The dative is especially striking with *pugnare*, which regularly takes the ablative with *cum*. E.g., *et cur mater acerrime pugnabat inferenti vim filio?*

The dative of purpose (service) was used in classical Latin only with such verbs as *esse* and *dare*. Late Latin extended this construction to many other verbs. It is especially noteworthy when used with *iacere*; thus, *iacent antiquae derisui cerimoniae* (= *contemptae sunt et obiectae derisui*).

The dative is used in ecclesiastical Latin for the accusative with *ad* to express purpose. For example: *nec sedandae aliquid admoveatur siti, quam . . .* (= *ad sedandam . . . sitim*). This construction, however, is seen also in the poets of all periods of the language, and in certain prose writers of the imperial epoch.

4. Accusative.

With a few exceptions ecclesiastical Latin has made no changes in the classical use of the accusative case.

Certain verbs which were intransitive in the classical period became transitive in the later periods.

Of this number *benedicere* and *maledicere* with the accusative are common in all ecclesiastical writers. E.g., *tum deinde se omnes maledicerent*.

Promereri (or *promerere*) in the sense of "to deserve well of" is regularly construed with *de* (Cicero, Off. 2, 15; Mur. 34). It is only after Augustus that it is found with the accusative alone. E.g., *ita nihil prodest promereri velle per hostias deos laevos*.

5. Ablative.

The ablative is the case whose uses are most extended. Some of the anomalies that arise here, had already appeared in the Classical period, but only by exception. Gradually they took a considerable place in the language.

The construction of *plenus* with the ablative instead of the genitive is found but rarely in Cicero and Caesar. It becomes more frequent in Livy and passes into current use from Quintilian's time on. Some late writers even add the preposition *a* or *ab* to it.

The ablative of the personal agent after a passive verb is often used without the preposition *a* (*ab*) in late Latin. E.g., *nunc doctore tanto in vias veritatis inductus*. The dative of the personal agent is used very frequently outside of the second periphrastic conjugation in late Latin.

With names of towns of the first and second declensions singular, classical Latin uses the locative case to denote place where. The popular language seems to have used beside the locative the ablative with or without the preposition *in*. Examples of this are to be found in pre- and post-classical prose.

To denote place where (but not in such common expressions as *multis locis*, *his regionibus*, *toto urbe terrarum*, etc.), the preposition *in* is often omitted in late Latin.

The ablative to express duration of time appeared in classical times, although rarely. This usage became more frequent in Livy and after him became current. E.g., *quamvis annis vivat innumeris*.

Rarely in ecclesiastical Latin we find the ablative of place where (with and without a preposition) used to express motion towards, instead of the accusative with the preposition *in*.

The following bibliography of comments on the General Report of the Investigating Committee has been prepared by Miss Elizabeth Guy, a graduate student in the Department of Latin

of the University of Pittsburgh. Comments which have appeared in the classical periodicals are easily accessible to the teacher of Latin and so are not included. Also newspaper reports have been omitted, since they have been so numerous that the task of collecting them would be endless.

Education, February, 1925: Editorial giving a short summary of the Report.

Educational Review, January, 1925: Article by Ernest W. Butterfield, "The Plenary Inspiration of the Dotted Line." Criticizes the questionnaire method, which has a usefulness comparable to that of asking "1,150 Eskimos whether they consider blubber a wholesome food."

Ibid.: An Editorial Review, unfavorable, ridiculing the Investigation. "Cannot get away from the suspicion of propaganda."

School Life, November, 1924: Review without comment.

School Life, December, 1924: Article by Carlton A. Wheeler, "Modern Foreign Language Study under Investigation." Favorable mention of Investigation as cause of similar program for modern languages.

Ibid.: Article by James F. Abel, "Nearly a Million Studying Latin in American Institutions." Summary and favorable comment. "... no finer attempt on the part of school people to evaluate fairly some part of their school program and to find ways of bettering it." Finds the proponents of Latin in a stronger position than for many years.

Journal of Educational Research, January, 1925: News Items and Communications, containing mention of Report, without comment.

School and Society, October 4, 1924: Summary of findings without comment.

School and Society, November 8, 1924: Presentation of important points by Dean West.

School and Society, January 10, 1925: Article by Quintus H. Flaccus, II, "Latin and the Statistical Method." Finds a high positive correlation between the study of Latin and the homicide rate in various states, but a high negative correlation between the study of Latin and the intelligence of the native population. Being sure that Latin is efficient education and makes for intelligence, the author is led to discredit the statistician.

School Review, September, 1924: Editorial, unfavorable, "The ordinary student of education would read the Report with the

feeling that the findings are biased by the prejudices of those who gathered the figures and interpreted their meaning."

I am indebted to Prof. Evan T. Sage for the following:

Every Latin teacher will find of great interest a recent book by Marian I. Newbegin, *The Mediterranean Lands*, an *Introductory Study in Human and Historical Geography* (New York, Knopf, 1924). The author finds three stages in the development of a civilization: concentration, expansion, collapse. A people adapts itself to local conditions of soil, climate, and relief: its consequent prosperity demands expansion, and this, in turn, causes exhaustion (pp. 205 ff.). Rome's need for foreign grain led her into areas too great for her to hold and which she could not afford to lose (p. 159). The original expansion of a nation is generally to a region like its previous home, but conditions are never reproduced exactly, and in Rome's case only force could hold the communications (p. 21). A sentence from the conclusion is illuminating.

"Each (Greece and Rome) in its turn fell, both because of progressive weakening at its center and because of the impossibility of checking divergent evolution at the periphery. But the tendency to radiate outward from a center meant that Mediterranean influences were felt in ever-widening circles till they reached practically to the confines of the world" (p. 212). The book is full of suggestions and reveals with unusual clearness the character and extent of the influence exerted on history by geographical and geological conditions. Human geography is a study much emphasized by educators today, and this book supplies to Latin teachers much valuable material.

Two articles have appeared in the *Classical Weekly* which will furnish the teacher of "Caesar" with interesting material for a discussion of parallels. The first article is by Colonel Spaulding and is entitled "The Classical Element in the German War Plan of 1914," 18, 142-143; the second is by Bruno Meinecke, and is entitled "A Modern Cannae," 18, 157-159. The following quotation from Mr. Meinecke's essay illustrates the nature of the material:

Teachers whose pupils find Caesar dull can inject new life into the work if they will compare modern methods of fighting with those of *Caesar's cilia, cippi, cervi, stimuli*, have their imita-

tion in the modern pits, barbed-wire entanglements, iron spikes and bayonets imbedded in heavy timber, mined fields, and other devices. "Modern" methods of trench fighting will be found as ancient as the battlefields on which the World War took place.

As a parallel in military tactics no more striking example can be found than that afforded in a comparison between Battle of Cannae and the Battle of Tannenberg.

Would it help in learning Spanish to know something about Latin, the language from which it came? The *Latin Leaflet* for February (1925) contains a demonstration lesson by Nina Weisinger, Adjunct Professor of Romance Languages in the University of Texas, in which she makes an abundant and systematic use of Latin.

A series of leaflets bearing the title "Little Studies in Greek for the Latin Teacher" is contemplated for publication by the Service Bureau for Classical Teachers. They will be designed to acquaint the Latin teacher who has never had an opportunity to study Greek with some important features of the language and to introduce him to Greek literature and art.

Further information may be obtained by writing to Miss F. Sabin, Service Bureau, Columbia University, N. Y.

The American Academy in Rome suffered an irreparable loss in the death of its vice-president, M. S. Breck Parkman Trowbridge, from pneumonia, on January 29. Mr. Trowbridge was a Charter Member of the Academy and had been trustee since 1906. He was also chairman of the Committee on the School of Fine Arts, and of the jury on architecture.

The enrollment at the Academy has reached a total of 49, of whom 21 are in the School of Classical Studies and 28 in the School of Fine Arts.

Space will permit but a brief notice of the opening of the First Summer Session of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. The Summer Session begins officially July 9 and ends on August 22. For further information about this most interesting course of studies, address Prof. Walter Miller, Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Missouri, who will have charge of the work.

ROY J. DEFERRARI.

AFFILIATED HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE SECTION

THE GENERAL CERTIFICATE AND THE HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA

A problem closely associated with the one discussed in the May issue of this publication is the question of the relation of the General Certificate, which is issued by the Catholic University of America, through its Committee on Affiliation, to those pupils of the affiliated high schools and academies who have fulfilled regulations numbers 8, 9 and 10, page 4 of the Syllabus, to the diploma which is presented by the school itself upon the satisfactory completion of a definite course. Before entering into the details involved in this problem it will be well to review carefully and understand thoroughly the meaning of these two terms, "certificate" and "diploma." In other words, we will establish the facts and then explain their relationship.

Etymologically the term "diploma" signifies something doubled over or folded. The diptychs of early Christian times are among the oldest of the forms best known. Historically the diploma was an official warrant granted by the Roman emperors to couriers, permitting them the use of public servants or materials. Later the term came to be applied to documents given by universities or other learned societies, indicating that the holder had attained proficiency in some branch of learning. At times, too, the term "diploma" was given to written testimonials, which were awarded for merit. As the educational systems became more closely articulated and partitioned, the term "diploma" took on the meaning commonly given to it at the present time.

A high school diploma is a properly signed and sealed document, which testifies that the party to whom it is conveyed has fulfilled certain specified conditions set out as prerequisites for graduation from the school issuing the diploma.

The value of this testimonial depends, therefore, on the qualifications and standards of the school from which it is received. It may imply one thing in one case and have quite a different meaning in another. For example, a school may decide to grant its diploma when a certain number of studies have been successfully followed for specified periods of time, while another

school may insist that, besides the above, other qualifications be met with in order that its diploma be awarded. In the first case we have clearly an example of what has come to be called a quantitative diploma, and in the second case the norm or measure has, in addition, certain qualitative characteristics. In some cases, then, the diploma signifies that a pupil has accomplished a definite amount of work, has shown average mental ability, and is judged worthy to go forth as a representative of the school issuing the diploma. In other cases it means more than mere graduation or the completion of a course of studies. That is to say, the qualitative diploma indicates that the holder is able to go in his studies in an institution of advanced grade. These differences, besides indicating that the value of the high school diploma is relative, clearly show that graduation from high school and entrance to college or other institution of higher grade are two distinct steps. If we keep this distinction in mind, it will aid us in answering the question stated in our opening paragraph.

The term "certificate" as employed by most educational agencies refers to a properly signed written statement, which is given by said agency as an evidence of the truth of the facts stated thereon. It is, in other words, a copy of the official record kept in the office of the agency issuing the certificate. When compared with the diploma issued by the school it is always of a more quantitative nature than the diploma. It attests or vouches that certain set requirements have been met, that by examination a definite and controlled number of units have been secured and that the party holding the certificate is granted certain privileges which have been reciprocally agreed to by the institutions affiliated with the standardizing agency. This last point should be kept in mind as a distinct feature of the certificate. If we may borrow an illustration from the banking system of our country, the certificate is like the letter of credit issued by a particular institution and accepted by all others under the same clearing house, provided, of course, that all the factors of the original agreement have been satisfied. Applying the above figure to the topic under discussion we may say that the certificate is analogous to the letter of credit, the institution accepting it, one of the several colleges affiliated with the University, and the University in this case is the agency issuing the

certificate to eligible pupils registered as students in one or other of the affiliated high schools.

The relation between the diploma issued by the school itself and the certificate awarded by the University can now be clearly stated. The former is the school's testimonial that the recipient has satisfactorily graduated, and the certificate granted to the pupil by the University signifies that the graduate is prepared to enter that affiliated college whose requirements have been met and that the pupil will be accepted without further examination.

In those cases where the general certificate is not secured, a special certificate specifying the actual number of units gained in high school will be granted under the condition set forth in Regulation 8, page 4 of the Syllabus. A discussion of these conditions will be given in a later number of the REVIEW.

In conclusion we may say that those affiliated high schools which make the securing of the general certificate a condition for the receiving of the school diploma should take under advisement the wider problem of the function of the high school as such. That is to say, they should study the purpose of the high school apart from its more specialized function as an institution wherein prospective college students are to be prepared. In doing this they will be aiding themselves and all their pupils and, what is of greater worth, they will be safeguarding their own autonomy.

NEWS ITEMS

"The Church and the Higher Education of Women" was the title of a lecture given by Dr. James J. Walsh at Mount St. Joseph's Academy, Hartford, Conn., May 17.

Rev. Father Saylor recently gave a series of talks at Sacred Heart Academy, Washington, D. C. As a project in English the members of the senior class gave a presentation of *The Upper Room*. The juniors of the department of English gave *Midsummer Night's Dream*. Both proved to be instructive and creditable.

St. Mary's High School of Urbana, Ohio, reports that over \$6,000 has been expended in the renovation of the school. In addition \$1,500 has been spent in equipping a new chemical laboratory and about \$750 for library books and materials. A

dramatic club has been organized at this school as a means of keeping the graduates in close touch with their Alma Mater. This last is a very commendable suggestion to all our high schools. The Very Rev. James H. Durham of Union City, Indiana, will address the graduates of St. Mary's this year.

Mr. Edward F. Bigelow of Sound Beach, Conn., gave a lecture to the student body of Immaculata Seminary on May 7. His Grace Archbishop Curley will preside at the Commencement Exercises and The Reverend J. H. Fasy, S.J., of Georgetown University, will address the students.

Among the notable lecturers who have addressed the pupils of St. Agnes' College and Academy of Memphis, Tenn., are Judge Kelly, whose subject was "Trained Workers for Girl Guidance;" the Rev. Dr. Blaisdell, who spoke on "The Real Vocation for Women;" The City Superintendent of the Schools, Prof. R. L. Jones, on "The Academic Requisites for Teachers." Mr. Ridley Willis, the well-known writer, spoke on "The Opportunities for Girls in the Field of Writing." The college department of this institution is to conduct a summer school this year from June 15 to July 24.

LEO. L. McVAY.

EDUCATIONAL NOTES

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY NOTES

On April 22, 1925, the corner-stone of the John K. Mullen Memorial Library was laid by His Eminence Patrick Cardinal Hayes. A notable assemblage, including many members of the Hierarchy, witnessed the event. The address was delivered by the Rev. Peter Guilday, Professor of American Church History in the Catholic University of America.

On Tuesday, May 26, a Convocation was held in the Gymnasium in commemoration of the sixteenth centennial of the Council of Nicaea. The Right Rev. Rector, Bishop Shahan, presided. The Most Rev. Pietro Fumasoni-Biondi, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, delivered an address on "Rome and Nicaea." The Very Rev. Patrick J. Healy, D.D., Professor of Church History and Dean of the School of Theology, read a paper on "The Council of Nicaea," and the Rev. Edwin J. Ryan, D.D., spoke on "Some Lessons from the Council of Nicaea." The musical program was rendered by the University Choir and the University Glee Club.

At the closing session of the eighth annual meeting of the American Council on Education, the Right Rev. Monsignor Pace, Vice-Rector of the Catholic University of America and Director of Studies, was elected president for the ensuing year. Monsignor Pace is widely known and loved, both for his eminent scholarship and for his untiring labors in the cause of Catholic education.

MEETING OF THE CATHOLIC EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION

The twenty-second annual meeting of the Catholic Educational Association and its departments will be held at Pittsburgh, Pa., on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, June 29, 30, July 1, 2, 1925. The Rt. Rev. Hugh C. Boyle, D.D., Bishop of Pittsburgh, has given a cordial invitation to the Association to hold the meeting in his Episcopal city, and his welcome and his patronage insure the success of the important educational conferences which are arranged under the direction of the Association. A committee of the leading Catholic educators of Pittsburgh has been appointed by the Rt. Rev. Bishop to make the necessary

arrangements and to place at the disposal of the Association and its departments the facilities needed for the holding of meetings. Rev. Ralph L. Hayes, D.D., Superintendent of the Parish Schools of the Diocese of Pittsburgh, is the executive secretary of this committee. A number of those who are members of committee served as members of the committee which had charge of the ninth annual meeting of the Association held in Pittsburgh, Pa., in 1912, and all are working to maintain the high standard of that meeting.

Following is the program of the General Meetings:

Tuesday, June 30:

11:00 A. M.—Opening of meeting. Reading of Reports. Appointment of Committees.

Paper: "Vocational Guidance." By the Reverend Francis P. Donnelly, S.J., St. Andrew-on-Hudson, Poughkeepsie, N. Y. Discussion.

Wednesday, July 1:

8:00 P. M.—Paper: "The Need of a Constructive Policy for Catholic Education." By the Reverend George Johnson, Ph.D., The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. Discussion.

Thursday, July 2: Closing Meeting.

2:30 P. M.—Reports. Election of officers.

Paper: "The Mission of Catholic Education." By the Honorable Dudley C. Wooten, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.

Reading of resolutions.

Adjournment.

Department of Colleges and Secondard Schools

Monday, June 29:

11:00 A. M.—Meeting of the Exececutive Committee of the Department of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Rooms of the Secretary General, William Penn Hotel.

Synod Hall

Tuesday, June 30:

2:30 P. M.—Opening meeting.

Appointment of Committees on Nominations and Resolutions.

Miscellaneous business.

President's Address: "Preservation of Christian Ideals and Principles in Education." By the Reverend Daniel J. McHugh, C.M., De Paul University, Chicago, Ill.

Paper: "The Definition of the Junior College." By the Very Reverend Ignatius A. Wagner, C.P.P.S., Ph.D., President, St. Joseph's College, Collegeville, P. O., Ind.

Discussion.

Paper: "The Work of the Standardization Committee—an Analysis and Some Recommendations." By the Reverend J. W. R. Maguire, C.S.V., St. Viator College, Bourbonnais, Ill.

Discussion.

Wednesday, July 1:

9:30 A. M.—Paper: "The Attendance of Catholic Students at non-Catholic Colleges and Universities in 1924." By Mr. Charles N. Lischka, Research Specialist, N. C. W. C. Bureau of Education.

Discussion.

Paper: "Examination of the Report of the Classical Association." By the Reverend William J. Young, S.J., St. Stanislaus' Seminary, Florissant, Mo.

Discussion.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

French Composition and Grammar Drill, by Assistant Professor William E. Knickerbocker, College of City of New York. Based on the French novel "En Famille," by Hector Malot.

It must be said that this small book was needed. We have many grammars, many readers, many novels arranged for class use or relations of voyages; we have a lot of manuals of conversation, and some good manuals of composition, but we had not yet, as far as I know, a book presenting in a short, clear and easy form, all the elements of grammatical exercise, conversation, composition, and translation from English into French.

In fact, to my belief, translation from English ought to be given a large place in any foreign language course. It is a mistake to think that a student will get something of French, for example, simply by translating some novels, however interesting they may be. In most of the cases—and I am speaking here through personal experience—the student takes some notes on his book, writes the words which he does not know, to get approximately the sense of the sentences, and is satisfied with a translation which enables him to read his text without too many errors. But is this translation, made with the help of a vocabulary, a truly profitable one? Does the pupil remember all these words, which interested him only during the lesson, and which he may not see again for several weeks? And, above all, does he understand the mechanism, the construction of the foreign sentence? Yet he has to master all of this, if he wants to be able to translate anything with accuracy. Before plunging into a French text, he has studied grammar for one year or six months; he has been given some grammatical examples, and has written some exercises. All this is insufficient.

Of course, I do not deny the necessity of a good reader. But, at the same time, it is indispensable, if the class is to be serious, to use a book of composition and conversation—a book which will remind the student the rules which he may have forgotten, give him a sufficient knowledge of the idioms, keep constantly in his mind the usefulness of syntax, teach him the foreign wording by translating the sentences from his own

language. This seems to be the most natural, and in many respects the easiest way to learn, and not to forget as soon as the class is over.

Professor Knickerbocker's book meets these requirements.

Each lesson is divided in distinct parts: a short English text, grammatical exercises, drill, composition, which will enable the student to show his real knowledge of French, and suggestions for conversation. At the end of the lesson, some notes give the reference to the rules, which are enunciated in the second part of the book.

The story, which is of course a very simplified and much abbreviated English translation of the French novel, will interest everybody. The exercises include drilling on various parts of the grammar, verbs, idiomatic expressions, translations of selected sentences from English into French. The compositions and conversations are based upon the text, or upon the illustrations, which may be described in French.

The second part is a short but complete résumé of French syntax. Everything is classified under a clear and simple form: article, position of adjectives, numbers, pronouns, verbs, idiomatic peculiarities, etc. Special attention has been given to the irregular verbs. A general vocabulary and an index complete the book.

In my opinion, Professor Knickerbocker's "French Composition and Grammar Drill" will meet with the greatest favor by all instructors. But it is not a book on which the pupil may pass over very quickly: its aim is to give a sound knowledge, which is attainable only by assiduous work. I think it ought to be used in every second-year class, together with a reader which will provide ample matter for translation from French into English.

ANDRE BENETEAU.

Introduction to Social Service, by Henry J. Spalding, S.J.
Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. 1923. Pp. 232.

The title would lead one to expect an outline of social work, but the contents are in the main what we usually find in an introduction to theoretic sociology. The author treats in simple and popular style the religious foundations of the social order,

the social institutions of the family, of the state and of property, social forces and processes, and the social influence of Judaism and Christianity, and in the concluding chapters gives some practical advice to prospective social workers, professional and volunteer.

The work, while somewhat sketchy, is very readable, with an abundance of concrete illustrations. A Catholic teacher who will take the time to run through it even rapidly will get a good elementary insight into some of the modern sociological trends as interpreted in the light of Catholic teaching. Father Spalding closely links up social endeavor and social work with Catholic moral and religious principles.

Some minor points here and there call for revision. On p. 54 the Bantu are described as a pygmy people. On p. 82 man is said to have an "instinctive" aversion against polygamy, a view which neither the psychologist nor the ethnologist would be willing to admit. On the same page it is affirmed that "peace and harmony must be out of the question in a polygamous family." Among many peoples polygamy does undoubtedly lead to family discord, but among many other peoples, especially primitive ones, it does not. The case against polygamy rests in part at least on more secure and more universal evidences, as the author himself would seem to intimate.

JOHN W. COOPER.

Health Education: Report of the Joint Committee on Health Problems in Education of the National Education Association and the American Medical Association, by Thos. D. Wood, M.D., Columbia University, New York City. 1924. Price, 50 cents.

A nation-wide interest in health education and a constantly growing tendency to give it the important place it deserves in our school programs has set for many educators the problem of familiarizing themselves with the best thought on this phase of education and of securing material which they might put into the hands of their teachers. Too often the only material found to be available has been the heavy, technical writings of medical men who knew much about disease, less about health, and nothing at all about pedagogy, or the pseudo scientific expositions of the untrained whose articles, couched in language more enter-

taining than sound, would lead one to believe that health education was a matter of training in five or ten habits per grade with a health poster contest thrown in. While many interesting and usable texts and supplementary readers in health and hygiene for children have appeared, there has been a decided dearth of material suitable for teachers and teacher training institutions. Any work which would fill this need adequately would of necessity have to be based on the accurate scientific knowledge of the various applied sciences which enter into the field of health education and at the same time meet the needs of the practical educator from the viewpoints of psychology, pedagogy and everyday use.

At last such a manual or handbook on health education for teachers has come in the form of the Report of the Joint Committee on Health Problems in Education of the National Education Association and the American Medical Association. This pamphlet aims to present not a course of study, nor a text on the subject matter of health education, or on methods of teaching health, but rather "a consensus of professional opinions relative to this field of education." It purports to provide the best available guidance to the schools of the country relative to health teaching in the immediate future. "Health Education" was prepared under the guidance of Dr. Thos. D. Wood, of Columbia University, by a technical committee of twenty-seven specialists drawn from the fields of education, medicine, educational psychology, dentistry, nutrition, physical education, biology and public health, and in their report they have pointed out succinctly but comprehensively the contributions of their specialties to positive constructive health building.

The use of the term "Health Education" today in our school curricula and in our educational writings is frequently misunderstood. To one group of teachers it means physiology and anatomy with a new label; to another, physical training or those activities engaged in for body development; to a third hygiene in a narrow physical sense. Modern health education is rightly concerned with the mental, emotional, and social health of children as well as with their physical well-being. Health education today sets its horizon far beyond that of the old physical hygiene, and under it we include any subject matter or training

which contributes to the maintenance or improvement of the mental, emotional, social and physical health of the individual or to the improvement of his environment from a health point of view. It includes selected materials from the fields of personal hygiene, nutrition, physical education, mental hygiene, social hygiene, community hygiene, safety or accident prevention, hygiene of the school plant and grounds and medical supervision and preventive medicine as well as health instruction or the actual teaching of health to groups of children. In this report of the Joint Committee these various phases of health education are discussed under Essential Subject Matter for the Teacher. Any teacher using this division for reference and study will get a pretty clear perspective of the field as a whole, as well as an outline of the outstanding points under each heading. One would like to see these brief studies in this section lengthened so that the report might serve as a source book for the best thought on the topics listed above, but the nature of the publication and the committee's adherence to its aim in making it a collection of authoritative statements prohibited this. However, each section is followed by full reference lists for further reading so that in its present form it will serve admirably as a guide outline for a more thorough study of the entire health education field.

Under the caption Educational Problems the teaching of health is considered and such fundamentals as Pedagogical Problems Underlying the Making of a Course of Study, Applications of Psychology to Health Education, the Place of Health Education in the Curriculum and Cooperation of the Home and School are treated.

The report does not contain a definite course of study but a whole section is devoted to suggestions for courses of study in health education which are considered under topical headings such as Sleep and Rest, Fresh Air, Sanitation, First Aid, Nutrition, Safety First, Play Activities, and Health Clubs. As a whole this part is suggestive rather than definite. There is no ready-made course of study for the teacher who wants something which she can take over and adopt in her own school, but it is replete with workable suggestions for the teacher who seeks only competent guidance in meeting her own situations. Without

doubt this report is the most authoritative collection of statements and opinions on this newly organized field yet available, and it should prove an invaluable supplement to the Catholic publications and articles on these subjects.

MARY E. SPENCER.

Security Against War, by Frances Kellor and Antonia Hatvany. New York: Macmillan Company, 1924. 2 vols. Pp. 851.

Miss Kellor is known as the author of a series of volumes in sociology, *Experimental Sociology*, *Out of Work*, *Straight America*, and *Immigration and the Future*. For this volume's preparation she has spent several years in Europe and has had the collaboration of Miss Hatvany, a skilled researcher with first-hand knowledge of conditions in several of the lately established nation-states.

The first four chapters describe the machinery of peace, under the Covenant, League of Nations and Conference of Ambassadors. The next nineteen chapters consider the difficulties, disturbances or wars in Saar Basin, Dantzic, Silesia, Albania, Fiume, Vilna, Memel, Aaland Isles, Hungary, Bulgaria, as well as South American questions and the Polish-Russian, and Graeco-Turkish Wars. The second volume deals with the Court of International Justice, the Two Hague Courts, problems presented and jurisdiction, American peace policies, Armament and Disarmament negotiations and treaties, and the outlawry of war. This study, based on documents, addresses, and statutes, quoting copious extracts, should be of value to statesmen, legislators, publicists, and professors of international law and recent European history.

RICHARD J. PURCELL.

Books Received

Textbooks

Allen, Nellie B., *United States* (Revised Edition). Boston: Ginn & Co., 1925. Pp. 348.

Cattànès, Hélène, *Causons ün Peu* (Conversations and discussions in French). Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1925. Pp. 272. Price, \$1.50.

Cowan, Harold E., and Loker, Harold W., *Exercises in Book-keeping and Business Problems*, Part II. Boston: Ginn & Co.

Davis, H. W., *Self-improvement in English*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1925. Pp. 444. Price, \$1.60.

Dubrulle, Noelia, and Manser, Herbert E., *French Composition and Pronunciation Exercises*. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1925. Pp. 404. Price, \$1.40.

Faris, John T., *Real Stories of the Geography Makers*. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1925. Pp. 332. Price, 92 cents.

Horn, Ernest, *The Learn to Study Readers*, Book III. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1925. Pp. 288. Price, 80 cents.

Long, William J., *Outlines of American Literature*. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1925. Pp. 434. Price, \$1.80.

Parker, Clifford S., Ph.D., *Favorite French Stories*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1925. Pp. 323. Price, 80 cents.

Picard, Louis Benoit, *La Petite Ville*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1925. Pp. 136. Price, \$1.15.

Roth, Suzanne, *Contes Faciles*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1925. Pp. 235. Price, 80 cents.

Saintsbury, George, *Primer of French Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1925. Pp. 168. Price, 85 cents.

Setchanove, L. J., *Five French Comedies*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1925. Pp. 276. Price, 80 cents.

Strong, Carolyn Hickman, *Eight French Plays*. Baltimore: The Norman Remington Co., 1925. Pp. 120. Price, 90 cents.

Miscellaneous

Clark, Isabel C., *The Villa by the Sea*. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1925. Pp. 375. Price, \$2.00.

Moffatt, J. E., S.J., *Thy Kingdom Come*, Series II. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1925. Pp. 64.

Richmond, Mary E., and Hall, Fred S., *Child Marriages*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1925. Pp. 159. Price, \$1.50.

Scott, Sir Walter, *A Legend of Montrose*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1924. Pp. 256. Price, \$1.20.

Reports

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. *Nineteenth Annual Report of the President and Treasurer*. New York City, 1924. Pp. 236.

Hawaii, Territory of, Department of Public Instruction, *Biennial Report, 1923-1924*, to the Governor and Legislature.

University of the State of New York, Department of Education. *Twentieth Annual Report for School Year Ending July 31, 1923*. Albany, 1924.

Pamphlets

Catholic Educational Association Bulletin, Index of the Catholic Educational Association Publications, 1904-1924. Columbus, Ohio, Office of the Secretary-General.

Cavanaugh, John, C.S.C., D.D., *The Relation of Religious Instruction to Education*. Notre Dame, Ind.: The Community House.

Harwood, James V., A.M., *A Study of the Constitution of the United States, in Question and Answer*. Boston: The Palmer Co., 1923. Pp. 24. Price, 20 cents.

Publications of the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Education: Bulletin, 1924, No. 40, Hood, William R., *Legal Provisions for Rural High Schools*; Bulletin, 1924, No. 35, McKown, Harry Charles, *The Trend of College Requirements, 1913-1922*; Phillips, Frank M., *Statistical Survey of Education, 1921-1922* (Bulletin, 1924, No. 38). Bulletin, 1924, No. 31, *Statistics of State School Systems, 1921-1922*. Library Leaflet No. 30, January, 1925. *List of References on Education for Citizenship*. List of Publications available March, 1925.